arXiv:1702.06442v1 [hep-th] 21 Feb 2017

The $\mathcal{N} = 3$ Weyl Multiplet in Four Dimensions

Jesse van Muiden and Antoine Van Proeyen

KU Leuven, Institute for Theoretical Physics,
Celestijnenlaan 200D B-3001 Leuven, Belgium.

Abstract

The main ingredient for local superconformal methods is the multiplet of gauge fields: the Weyl multiplet. We construct the transformations of this multiplet for $\mathcal{N} = 3$, $D = 4$. The construction is based on a supersymmetry truncation from the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Weyl multiplet, on coupling with a current multiplet, and on the implementation of a soft algebra at the nonlinear level, extending $\mathfrak{su}(2, 2|3)$. This is the first step towards a superconformal calculus for $\mathcal{N} = 3$, $D = 4$.

e-mails: jesse.vanmuiden@kuleuven.be, antoine.vanproeyen@fys.kuleuven.be

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 The $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Weyl Multiplet and the current method **5**
2.1 The rigid $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM multiplet 5
2.2 The $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Weyl multiplet and its linear variations 9
2.3 The nonlinear variations of the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Weyl multiplet 14

3 The $\mathcal{N} = 3$ Weyl multiplet **18**
3.1 The truncation to $\mathcal{N} = 3$ extended conformal supergravity 18
3.2 Components of the Weyl multiplet(s) 21

4 Supersymmetry transformations of the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ Weyl multiplet **23**
4.1 The linear supersymmetry transformations 23
4.2 The nonlinear supersymmetry transformations and the soft algebra 26

5 Conclusion **28**

A Useful identities and conventions **30**
A.1 Conventions 30
A.2 Chiral notations 30
A.3 Traces and hermitian conjugation 32

1 Introduction

In supergravity it is often a non trivial exercise to construct theories in which gravity multiplets are coupled to matter multiplets, so called matter-coupled supergravity theories. The most systematic approach that has been used for such constructions is the superconformal method. In this method one starts with a supergravity theory that has additional conformal symmetries. The multiplet of gauge fields in these theories is called the Weyl multiplet. This forms the background for general superconformal-invariant interactions of matter multiplets. The superconformal symmetry is then broken to super-Poincaré symmetry [1]. This procedure is a far easier task than constructing a Poincaré supergravity from scratch. Furthermore, the extra symmetries in conformal supergravity also offer a systematic approach to the construction of the matter couplings and reveal much of its structure. This superconformal method has therefore been used extensively in the past for different supergravity theories in multiple dimensions and number of supersymmetries. The Weyl multiplet is also the basis for constructing conformal supergravity theories, which are theories with higher derivatives. E.g. recently the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ conformal supergravity theories have been studied in [2, 3].

An old argument says that $\mathcal{N} = 3$ rigid supersymmetry theories always have a fourth supersymmetry, and hence are in fact $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric theories. This is based on

theories that have an action with a σ-model for the scalars. For every supersymmetry added to the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ case one needs an additional parallel complex structure, see [4, 5] for a more detailed discussion on this fact. Consequently, for $\mathcal{N} = 3$ theories one needs two of such structures. However, similarly as for the complex numbers, two complex structures automatically lead to a third one. This then immediately results in a theory that has four supersymmetries. Another argument for the non-existence of $\mathcal{N} = 3$ supersymmetric theories that are not $\mathcal{N} = 4$ theories comes from the analysis of multiplets of massless states. The irreducible representations with maximal spin 1 carry either helicities $(1, 3\times 1/2, 3\times 0, -1/2)$ or $(1/2, 3\times 0, 3\times -1/2, -1)$. Both separately are not CPT invariant. To ensure CPT invariance, one should join both representations. The field content is then that of an $\mathcal{N} = 4$ theory. The kinetic action that one can construct with at most 2 spacetime derivatives shows that indeed the fourth supersymmetry is always present. Recently, however, a completely new approach has been taken to look at four-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 3$ theories, which has taken quite some interest from the community [6–13]. These approaches do not rely on the usual Lagrangian philosophy and use techniques originating from holography to discover new physics in these theories.

This inclusion of $\mathcal{N} = 3$ in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ does not hold for supergravity. In that case other representations, going up to spin 2 distinguish $\mathcal{N} = 3$ from $\mathcal{N} = 4$. Poincaré supergravity-matter couplings with $\mathcal{N} = 3$ in four dimensions have been considered for their representation content [14], in (harmonic) superspace [15, 16] and using the group-manifold approach [17].[1] However, it was never done using the superconformal method. It can be expected that these methods will result in the same theory for the supergravity obtained by promoting 3 of the 4 rigid supersymmetries in the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric σ-model. In any case the superconformal construction of $\mathcal{N} = 3$ Poincaré supergravity theory may shed more light on the structure of these theories whose solutions were recently studied in the context the AdS/CFT correspondence [19, 20]. Also the alternative $\mathcal{N} = 3$ theories mentioned above may be studied with superconformal methods.

The first step in this programme is constructing the Weyl multiplet. In fact, a separate motivation for the construction of the Weyl multiplet is that it seems to be the final gap in the construction of gauge multiplets of conformal supergravities. These theories have been constructed for all the possible superconformal groups in dimensions varying from $D = 2$ to $D = 6$. It is proven using an algebra argument by Nahm in [21] that no superconformal algebra exists in higher dimensions.[2] Much work has been done to find the Weyl multiplets in different dimensions and with a different number of supersymmetries, see e.g. [23]. In two dimensions the possibility for Weyl multiplets has been discussed in [24, 25]. In three dimensions the different multiplets are discussed in [26–28]. In four dimensions the Weyl multiplet for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ has already been found in [29]. For $\mathcal{N} = 2$ it was found in [30] and for $\mathcal{N} = 4$ in [31]. For five dimensions only $\mathcal{N} = 2$ appears in Nahm's classification, and the corresponding Weyl multiplets were found in [32, 33]. The Weyl multiplets in 6 dimensions

[1] The $\mathcal{N} = 3$ Poincaré supergravity theory in four dimensions was also studied in terms of the super-BEH effect in [18].

[2] Note, however, that a Weyl multiplet has been constructed for $D = 10$ in [22], which is not based on a linear superalgebra.

were constructed for $(1,0)$ supersymmetry in [34] and for $(2,0)$ in [35] and these are the only cases that appear in the classification of Nahm. For the case of $\mathcal{N}=3$ conformal supergravity in four dimensions suggestions have been made for the field content of the Weyl multiplet [36, 37]. The actual derivation of the full symmetry transformations, however, has never been done.

Before discussing the explicit content of this paper we will give a small introduction into some general features of the Weyl multiplets in four dimensions. The Weyl multiplet is a massive multiplet with maximal spin 2. For every spin, the fields of massive multiplets form representations of $\mathrm{USp}(2\mathcal{N})$ [38, 39]. These are given in Table 1. The explicit $\mathrm{SO}(3,1) \times \mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{N})$ representations known in four dimensions will be discussed in Section 3.2 in more detail.

J	2	$3/2$	1	$1/2$	0
$\mathcal{N}=1$	1	2	1		
$\mathcal{N}=2$	1	4	$5+1$	4	1
$\mathcal{N}=3$	1	6	$14+1$	$14'+6$	14
$\mathcal{N}=4$	1	8	27	48	42

Table 1: $\mathrm{USp}(2\mathcal{N})$ *representations of spin J content of Weyl multiplets.*

We have constructed the Weyl multiplet for $\mathcal{N}=3$ conformal supergravity and found the nonlinear supersymmetry transformations of the fields in the multiplet. The applied method resulted in one Weyl multiplet. However, in other dimensions and with a different amount of supersymmetries it was found that there are several Weyl multiplets. Future work will have to determine if this is also the case for the $\mathcal{N}=3$ theory in four dimensions. The constructed Weyl multiplet consists of $64+64$ fermionic and bosonic components. The supersymmetric algebra applied on this representation resulted in a consistent soft algebra as is usually the case for gauged supersymmetric theories.

Previous research in the subject has often made use of the so-called method of current multiplets [40, 31, 41]. This method requires a rigid supersymmetry theory at the outset. Because there is no known $\mathcal{N}=3$ rigid supersymmetric field theory we have applied a three-step procedure. The first step in this method consists of consistently truncating the $\mathcal{N}=4$ current multiplet of the $\mathcal{N}=4$ Maxwell multiplet, obtained in [31], to three supersymmetries. In the second step, similar to the case of $\mathcal{N}=4$ conformal supergravity, the Weyl multiplet is found by coupling a field to every current. By imposing invariance of the first order action (which consists of the $current \times field$ terms) one is able to derive the linear supersymmetry variations of the fields in the Weyl multiplet, starting from the variations of the currents. These transformations have then been checked for consistency with the symmetry algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2,2|3)$. In the third step, the nonlinear supersymmetry variations are found by taking a general ansatz for the nonlinear terms and checking for consistency with the soft algebra, the chiral weights and the conformal weights of the fields.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recapitulate the already known Weyl multiplet for $\mathcal{N}=4$ conformal supergravity and its construction using the current method.

The truncation to $\mathcal{N}=3$ conformal supergravity will be discussed in Section 3. This will lead to the representation of the gravity multiplet (Weyl multiplet) for $\mathfrak{su}(2,2|3)$. The R-symmetry group will break from SU(4) into U(3). The truncated Weyl multiplet, as already mentioned, consists of $64+64$ independent components while the $\mathcal{N}=4$ multiplet consists of $128+128$ independent components. A comparison of all the known Weyl multiplets in four dimensions is given in Section 3.2.

In Section 4 we will give the explicit linear and nonlinear supersymmetry variations of the $\mathcal{N}=3$ Weyl multiplet and discuss the method used to find them. The nonlinear variations are discussed in detail in 4.2. An important part of this derivation leads to the structure of the soft algebra of the theory, which is a modification of the algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2,2|3)$. Such soft algebras contain structure functions depending on the usual infinitesimal parameters as well as on the fields present in the Weyl multiplet itself.

Finally, in Section 5 a discussion of the found results will be given.

Appendix A discusses some of the conventions and identities that have been used throughout the paper.

2 The $\mathcal{N}=4$ Weyl Multiplet and the current method

The content of the $\mathcal{N}=4$ Weyl multiplet was given in [42–44] and the transformation rules were fully constructed in [31, 45]. The method used was the so called supercurrent method. The philosophy is to start with a rigid supersymmetric theory and perturb the theory around flat space. In this sense one splits the Lagrangian of the theory in a zeroth order and a first order part:

$$\mathcal{L}=\mathcal{L}_0+\mathcal{L}_1+\dots. \tag{2.1}$$

The zeroth order Lagrangian contains the kinetic terms of the rigid supersymmetry theory and the first order part contains the coupling of the currents with the fields in the multiplet. This first order coupling uniquely determines as well the content of the Weyl multiplet as its linear supersymmetry variations. We will recapitulate this construction of [31] in Section 2.2. The nonlinear variations are determined by consistency with the appropriate algebra. This is discussed in Section 2.3.

The rigid supersymmetric theory from which the $\mathcal{N}=4$ Weyl multiplet in four dimensions was constructed is the unique $\mathcal{N}=4$ SYM (super-Yang–Mills) theory that was introduced in [46]. Section 2.1 will summarize the field content of this theory.

2.1 The rigid $\mathcal{N}=4$ SYM multiplet

The rigid $\mathcal{N}=4$ super-Maxwell theory contains a gauge field B_μ, which is an SU(4) singlet, four fermions ψ_i, in the SU(4) vector representation and six scalars, $\varphi_{ij}=-\varphi_{ji}$, combined in the **6** representation of SU(4). The Latin indices denote the representation of the fields with respect to this SU(4) R-symmetry group and run from 1 to 4. We use chiral spinors

$\psi^i = P_L\psi^i$ and their complex (or charge) conjugates $\psi_i = P_R\psi_i$. We use the notations from [47] to indicate the chiralities. The scalar fields obey the following reality relations

$$\varphi^{ij} = \varphi^*_{ij} = -\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ijkl}\varphi_{kl}. \tag{2.2}$$

Instead of using the vector B_μ we will often rather use its field strength, or even better the (anti-)selfdual parts of this tensor:

$$F_{\mu\nu} = 2\partial_{[\mu}B_{\nu]}, \qquad F^{\pm}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}(F_{\mu\nu} \pm \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}). \tag{2.3}$$

The Lagrangian is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\overline{\psi}^i \overleftrightarrow{\partial\!\!\!/}\, \psi_i - \frac{1}{2}(\partial^\mu\varphi_{ij})(\partial_\mu\varphi^{ij}), \tag{2.4}$$

which is conformally invariant, using the coordinate transformations with

$$\xi^\mu(x) = a^\mu + \lambda^{\mu\nu}x_\nu + \lambda_{\rm D}x^\mu + (x^2\lambda^\mu_{\rm K} - 2x^\mu x^\nu\lambda_{{\rm K}\nu})\,, \tag{2.5}$$

and intrinsic dilatation transformations[3]

$$\delta_{\rm D}B_\mu = 0\,, \qquad \delta_{\rm D}\varphi_{ij} = \lambda_{\rm D}\varphi_{ij}\,, \qquad \delta_{\rm D}\psi^i = \tfrac{3}{2}\lambda_D\psi^i\,. \tag{2.6}$$

On top of that is invariant for the following supersymmetric variations ($\epsilon^i = P_L\epsilon^i$ and $\epsilon_i = P_R\epsilon_i$)

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)B_\mu &= \frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^i\gamma_\mu\psi_i + \text{h.c.}\,,\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)\psi^i &= -\frac{1}{4}\gamma^{\mu\nu}F^-_{\mu\nu}\epsilon^i - \partial\!\!\!/\varphi^{ij}\epsilon_j - 2\varphi^{ij}\eta_j\,,\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)\varphi_{ij} &= \overline{\epsilon}_{[i}\psi_{j]} - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ijkl}\overline{\epsilon}^k\psi^l.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

The action is invariant under rigid superconformal transformations, which means that ϵ^i can be linear in the spacetime variable x^μ:

$$\epsilon^i(x) = \epsilon^i_0 + x^\mu\gamma_\mu\eta^i\,, \tag{2.8}$$

where ϵ^i_0 and $\eta^i = P_R\eta^i$ are constants.

The superconformal transformations satisfy the superconformal $\mathcal{N} = 4$ algebra, which includes $\mathfrak{su}(4)$ transformations

$$\delta_{\rm U}\varphi_{ij} = 2\lambda_{[i}{}^k\varphi_{j]k}\,, \qquad \delta_{\rm U}\psi_i = \lambda_i{}^j\psi_j\,, \tag{2.9}$$

with an anti-hermitian traceless parameter $\lambda_i{}^j$. These transformations satisfy the algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2,2|4)$. The general form of the superconformal algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2,2|\mathcal{N})$ has been found in [48]

[3]See [47, Sec. 15.3] for more details.

for general $\mathcal{N}$. It is generated by the standard conformal generators of $\mathfrak{su}(2,2)$, together with supersymmetry generators ($Q^i = P_R Q^i$ and $Q_i = P_L Q_i$), special supersymmetry generators ($S^i = P_L S^i$ and $S_i = P_R S_i$) and the $(\mathfrak{s})\mathfrak{u}(\mathcal{N})$ R-symmetry generators $U_i{}^j$ (and T). The non-trivial commutation relations are as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
[M_{[ab]}, M_{[cd]}] &= 4\eta_{[a[c}M_{[d]b]]}, & [P_a, M_{[bc]}] &= 2\eta_{a[b}P_{c]},\\
[K_a, M_{bc}] &= 2\eta_{a[b}K_{c]}, & [D, P_a] &= P_a,\\
[P_a, K_b] &= 2(\eta_{ab}D + M_{ab}), & [D, K_a] &= -K_a,\\
[M_{ab}, Q^i_\alpha] &= -\frac{1}{2}(\gamma_{ab}Q^i)_\alpha, & [M_{ab}, S^i_\alpha] &= -\frac{1}{2}(\gamma_{ab}S^i)_\alpha,\\
[D, Q^i_\alpha] &= \frac{1}{2}Q^i_\alpha, & [D, S^i_\alpha] &= -\frac{1}{2}S^i_\alpha,\\
[U_i{}^j, Q^k_\alpha] &= \delta^k_i Q^j_\alpha - \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}\delta^j_i Q^k_\alpha, & [U_i{}^j, S^k_\alpha] &= \delta^k_i S^j_\alpha - \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}\delta^j_i S^k_\alpha,\\
[U_i{}^j, Q_{\alpha k}] &= -\delta^j_k Q_{\alpha i} + \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}\delta^j_i Q_{\alpha k}, & [U_i{}^j, S_{\alpha k}] &= -\delta^j_k S_{\alpha i} + \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}\delta^j_i S_{\alpha k},\\
[T, Q^i_\alpha] &= \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{i}Q^i_\alpha, & [T, S^i_\alpha] &= -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{i}S^i_\alpha,\\
[K_a, Q^i_\alpha] &= (\gamma_a S^i)_\alpha, & [P_a, S^i_\alpha] &= (\gamma_a Q^i)_\alpha,\\
\{Q_{\alpha i}, Q^{\beta j}\} &= -\frac{1}{2}\delta^j_i(\gamma^a)_\alpha{}^\beta P_a, & \{S_{\alpha i}, S^{\beta j}\} &= -\frac{1}{2}\delta^j_i(\gamma^a)_\alpha{}^\beta K_a,
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.10}
$$

$$
\{Q_{i\alpha}, S^{j\beta}\} = -\frac{1}{2}\delta^j_i\delta^\beta_\alpha D - \frac{1}{4}\delta^j_i(\gamma^{ab})_\alpha{}^\beta M_{ab} + \frac{4-\mathcal{N}}{2\mathcal{N}}\mathrm{i}\delta^j_i\delta^\beta_\alpha T - \delta^\beta_\alpha U_i{}^j.
$$

Remark that the U(1) generator T is optional[4] for $\mathcal{N} = 4$. It does not appear at the right-hand side of (2.10). This implies that representations of the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ superconformal algebra may or may not have such chiral transformations. One can check that the supersymmetry variations of the SYM multiplet constrain the chiral weights of ϵ_i and ϵ^i in that representation to be zero. But the Weyl multiplet that will be presented below has transformations under the T symmetry.

The translations are realized on the fields of the super-Maxwell multiplet as derivatives $P_\mu = \partial_\mu$, except on the gauge field, where they act as covariant translations: $P_\mu B_\nu = F_{\mu\nu}$. The generators are related to transformations with parameters as

$$
\delta = \xi^a P_a + \tfrac{1}{2}\lambda^{ab}M_{[ab]} + \lambda_{\mathrm{D}}D + \lambda^a_{\mathrm{K}}K_a + \lambda_i{}^j U_j{}^i + \lambda_T T + \bar{\epsilon}^i Q_i + \bar{\epsilon}_i Q^i + \bar{\eta}^i S_i + \bar{\eta}_i S^i\,. \tag{2.11}
$$

[4]Some papers distinguish in this way PSU$(2,2|4)$ from SU$(2,2|4)$, where the former does not contain the U(1) and defines a simple superalgebra.

In this way, the last anticommutator in (2.10) e.g. implies

$$\begin{aligned}
[\delta_S(\eta),\delta_Q(\epsilon)] =&\delta_{\rm D}(\lambda_{\rm D})+\delta_{\rm M}(\lambda^{ab})+\delta_{\rm U}(\lambda_i{}^j)+\delta_T(\lambda_T)\,,\\
\lambda_{\rm D} =&\tfrac{1}{2}(\epsilon^i\eta_i+{\rm h.c.})\,,\\
\lambda^{ab} =&\tfrac{1}{4}(\epsilon^i\gamma^{ab}\eta_i+{\rm h.c.})\,,\\
\lambda_i{}^j =&\bar\epsilon^j\eta_i-\bar\epsilon_i\eta^j-\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}}\delta_i^j(\bar\epsilon^k\eta_k-\bar\epsilon_k\eta^k)\,,\\
\lambda_T =&\tfrac{\mathcal{N}-4}{2\mathcal{N}}{\rm i}\bar\epsilon^i\eta_i+{\rm h.c.}.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.12}$$

The superconformal symmetries are rigid symmetries, but the U(1) gauge transformation of B_μ is local. As for other supersymmetric gauge theories, one then finds soft algebras. This means that the commutator relations of (Q and S) symmetries lead to U(1) transformations with parameters dependent of the fields inside the multiplet itself.[5] One finds that the supersymmetry commutator acting on the gauge field B_μ gives the following result:

$$[\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon_1(x),\eta_1),\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon_2(x),\eta_2)]B_\mu=-\frac{1}{2}(\bar\epsilon_1^i(x)\gamma^\nu\epsilon_{2i}(x)+{\rm h.c.})F_{\nu\mu}+\partial_\mu\lambda_{\rm U(1)}\tag{2.13}$$

where $\lambda_{\rm U(1)}$ is the gauge parameter and the x-dependence of $\epsilon(x)$ is given in (2.8). This gauge parameter is now dependent of the fields in the multiplet, explicitly one has that

$$\lambda_{\rm U(1)}=-\epsilon_2^i(x)\epsilon_1^j(x)\varphi_{ij}.\tag{2.14}$$

One can check that the supersymmetry variations given in equation (2.7) are consistent with the algebra given in (2.10) plus the mentioned gauge parameter term.

Using the Noether procedure the stress energy tensor, supercurrent and R-symmetry currents are found from the Lagrangian:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta_{\mu\nu}=&-4F^+_{\mu\lambda}F_\nu^{-\lambda}-\overline{\psi}^i\gamma_{(\mu}\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}_{\nu)}\psi_i+\eta_{\mu\nu}(\partial^\rho\varphi_{ij})(\partial_\rho\varphi^{ij})\\
&-2(\partial_\mu\varphi_{ij})(\partial_\nu\varphi^{ij})-\frac{1}{3}(\eta_{\mu\nu}\Box-\partial_\mu\partial_\nu)(\varphi_{ij}\varphi^{ij})\,,\\
\mathcal{J}_{\mu i}=&-\frac{1}{2}\gamma^{\nu\rho}F^-_{\nu\rho}\gamma_\mu\psi_i-2\varphi_{ij}\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}_\mu\psi^j-\frac{2}{3}\gamma_{\mu\lambda}\partial^\lambda(\varphi_{ij}\psi^j)\,,\\
v_\mu{}^i{}_j=&\varphi^{ik}\overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}_\mu\varphi_{kj}+\overline{\psi}^i\gamma_\mu\psi_j-\frac{1}{4}\delta^i_j\overline{\psi}^k\gamma_\mu\psi_k\,.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.15}$$

These currents are, as usual, only determined modulo equations of motion of the matter fields in the SYM multiplet. These equations of motion are given by

$$\partial^\mu F_{\mu\nu}=0,\qquad \not\partial\psi^i=0,\qquad \Box\varphi_{ij}=0.\tag{2.16}$$

[5] In superspace this effect is due to the fact that we have taken a Wess-Zumino gauge, and these transformations are the decomposition rules to stay in this gauge.

The stress energy tensor is improved such that it is symmetric and traceless.[6] Furthermore, current conservation and conformal symmetry tells us that

$$\partial^\mu \Theta_{\mu\nu} = 0, \qquad \partial^\mu v_{\mu j}{}^{i} = 0, \qquad \partial^\mu \mathcal{J}_{\mu i} = 0, \qquad \gamma^\mu \mathcal{J}_{\mu i} = 0. \tag{2.17}$$

The last equality is a consequence of the conformal symmetry. This becomes clear when the supersymmetry variation of the stress energy tensor is given.

2.2 The $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Weyl multiplet and its linear variations

We are now able to apply the supersymmetry variations of the SYM multiplet to the currents that were found. We will find that to close the superalgebra on the Noether currents new (matter) currents have to be introduced. The full multiplet of currents will then give rise to the Weyl multiplet and its linear supersymmetry variations, as will be explained in more detail below.

The variation of the stress energy tensor is given by

$$\delta_Q(\epsilon)\Theta_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^k \gamma_{\rho(\mu}\partial^\rho \mathcal{J}_{\nu)k} + \text{h.c.}. \tag{2.18}$$

This is something that could be expected since it says that the graviton and gravitino are related through supersymmetry variations. However, when the supersymmetry current is varied one finds something new, namely:

$$\delta_Q(\epsilon)\mathcal{J}_{\mu i} = -\frac{1}{2}\gamma^\nu \Theta_{\mu\nu}\epsilon_i - (\not{\partial} v_{\mu i}{}^{j} + \frac{1}{3}\gamma_{\mu\lambda}\partial^\lambda \gamma^\rho v_{\rho i}{}^{j})\epsilon_j - \varepsilon_{ijkl}(\partial^\lambda t^{jk}_{\lambda\mu} + \frac{1}{3}\gamma_{\mu\nu}\partial^\nu \gamma^{ab} t^{jk}_{ab})\epsilon^l. \tag{2.19}$$

Here $t^{ij}_{\mu\nu}$ is the first current not associated to a symmetry. Its explicit form in terms of the SYM multiplet is given by

$$t^{ij}_{ab} = 2\varphi^{ij}F^-_{ab} + \frac{1}{2}\overline{\psi}^i \gamma_{ab}\psi^j. \tag{2.20}$$

The rest of the currents in the supercurrent multiplet are found by consecutively applying these supersymmetry variations. This procedure will result in five more currents associated to matter fields. In terms of the SYM multiplet these new currents are given by

$$\begin{aligned} c =& F^-_{ab}F^{ab-}\,, \qquad \lambda_i = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^{ab}F^+_{ab}\psi_i\,, \qquad e_{ij} = \overline{\psi}_i\psi_j, \\ \xi^{ij}_k =& \mathrm{i}\varepsilon^{ijmn}\varphi_{m(n}\psi_{k)}\,, \qquad d^{ij}_{k\ell} = \varphi^{ij}\varphi_{k\ell} - \frac{1}{6}\delta^{ij}_{k\ell}\varphi^{mn}\varphi_{mn} \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

The explicit supersymmetric variations of the currents are given by

$$\delta_Q(\epsilon)c = \overline{\epsilon}_i \not{\partial}\lambda^i,$$

[6] The tracelessness is possible due to conformal invariance. One can easily verify this applying the Noether procedure for scale transformations.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta_Q(\epsilon)\lambda_i =&\frac{1}{2}c^*\epsilon_i + \frac{1}{2}\not{\partial}e_{ik}\epsilon^k - \frac{1}{4}\gamma_{\mu\nu}(\not{\partial}t^{\mu\nu}_{ik})\epsilon^k,\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)e_{ij} =&\overline{\epsilon}_{(i}\lambda_{j)} + \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon_{kmn(i}\overline{\epsilon}^k\not{\partial}\xi^{mn}_{j)},\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)t^{ij}_{\rho\sigma} =&\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ijk\ell}\overline{\epsilon}_k\gamma_{[\rho}\mathcal{J}_{\sigma]\ell} - \frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^{[i}\gamma_{\rho\sigma}\lambda^{j]} + \frac{1}{6}\varepsilon^{ijk\ell}\overline{\epsilon}_n\not{\partial}\gamma_{\rho\sigma}\xi^n_{k\ell},\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)\xi^{ij}_k =&-\frac{3}{16}\varepsilon^{ijmn}\gamma_{ab}t^{ab}_{km}\epsilon_n - \frac{3}{8}\varepsilon^{ijmn}e_{mk}\epsilon_n + \frac{3}{4}\gamma^\mu v_{\mu k}{}^{[i}\epsilon^{j]} - \frac{3}{4}\not{\partial}d^{k\ell}_{ij}\epsilon_\ell - (\text{trace}),\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)d^{ij}_{k\ell} =&\frac{4}{3}\overline{\epsilon}_{[k}\xi^{ij}_{\ell]} + \frac{4}{3}\overline{\epsilon}_n\delta^{[i}_{[k}\xi^{j]n}_{\ell]} + \text{h.c.},\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)\Theta_{\mu\nu} =&-\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^k\gamma_{\lambda(\mu}\partial^\lambda\mathcal{J}_{\nu)k} + \text{h.c.},\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)\mathcal{J}_{\mu i} =&-\frac{1}{2}\gamma^\nu\Theta_{\mu\nu}\epsilon_i - (\not{\partial}v_{\mu i}{}^k + \frac{1}{3}\gamma_{\mu\lambda}\partial^\lambda\gamma^\nu v_{\nu i}{}^k)\epsilon_k\\
&-\varepsilon_{ik\ell m}(\partial^\lambda t^{k\ell}_{\lambda\mu} + \frac{1}{3}\gamma_{\mu\lambda}\partial^\lambda\gamma^{ab}t^{k\ell}_{ab})\epsilon^m,\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)v_{\mu j}{}^i =&-\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^i\mathcal{J}_{\mu j} + \frac{1}{8}\delta^i_j\overline{\epsilon}^k\mathcal{J}_{\mu k} + \frac{2\text{i}}{3}\overline{\epsilon}^k\gamma_{\mu\lambda}\partial^\lambda\xi^i_{kj} - \text{h.c.}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.22}
$$

One can check these by applying the known variation of the $\mathcal{N}=4$ SYM multiplet to the currents, which are themselves nonlinear combinations of the SYM fields.

That these extra currents are needed will become clear when the full gravity multiplet is constructed. We will see that without these currents the number of fermionic and bosonic components would not equal each other. In turn, this inequality would break supersymmetry.

The gravity multiplet is found by coupling each of the currents to a corresponding field in the Lagrangian. This field will either be a gauge field or a matter field, depending on whether the current is related to a symmetry or not. The explicit form of the Lagrangian is the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_1 = \Theta_{\mu\nu}h^{\mu\nu} + D^{ij}_{k\ell}d^{k\ell}_{ij} + (\overline{\psi}^{\mu i}\mathcal{J}_{\mu i} + \overline{\chi}^{ij}_k\xi^k_{ij} +\\
T^{\mu\nu}_{ij}t^{ij}_{\mu\nu} + V_{\mu j}{}^i v^{\mu j}_i + E_{ij}e^{ij} + Cc + \Lambda^i\lambda_i + \text{h.c.}),
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.23}
$$

where $h_{\mu\nu}$ is the first order perturbation of the frame field:

$$
e^a_\mu = \delta^a_\mu + h^a_\mu + \cdots . \tag{2.24}
$$

That we find the first order perturbation of the metric is the reason that one can view this procedure as perturbing the rigid supersymmetric theory around flat space.

All the currents for the SU(2, 2|4) symmetry group, together with their respective gauge/matter fields, chiral and Weyl weights, are listed in Table 2. Assigning chiral weights to the fields in four dimensional $\mathcal{N}=4$ supergravity is rather subtle. The reason is that naively these weights would vanish. In Section 2.3 we will describe this subtlety in more detail.

Naively one would expect that the first order Lagrangian has more gauge fields, associated to all the symmetries in the SU(2, 2|4) group, and would look like

$$
\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{L}_{matter} + h^a_\mu\Theta^\mu_a + (\overline{\psi}^i_\mu\mathcal{J}^\mu_i + \overline{\phi}^i_\mu\tilde{\mathcal{J}}^\mu_i + V_{\mu j}{}^i v^{\mu j}_i + \text{h.c.}) + \omega^{ab}_\mu W^\mu_{ab} + b_\mu B^\mu + f^a_\mu F^\mu_a\,, \tag{2.25}
$$

Field	Gauge field	Properties	SU(4) repr.	Weyl weight	Chiral weight
c	C	complex	**1**	0	2
λ_i	Λ_i	$P_L\Lambda_i \;=\; \Lambda_i$	**4**	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2}$
e_{ij}	E_{ij}	symmetric & complex	**10**	1	1
t^{ij}_{ab}	T^{ij}_{ab}	$T^{ij}_{ab} = T^{[ij]}_{ab}, \quad \tilde{T}^{ij}_{ab} = -T^{ij}_{ab}$	**6**	1	1
ξ^{ij}_k	χ^{ij}_k	$\chi^{[ij]}_k = \chi^{ij}_k,$ $P_L\chi^{ij}_k \;=\; \chi^{ij}_k$	**20**	$\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
d^{ij}_{kl}	D^{ij}_{kl}	$D^{[ij]}_{[kl]} = D^{ij}_{kl}, \quad D^{ij}_{kj} = 0$ $D^{ij}_{kl} = \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ijmn}\varepsilon_{klpq}D^{pq}_{mn}$	**20′**	2	0
$\Theta_{\mu\nu}$	e^a_μ	frame field	**1**	-1	0
$\mathcal{J}^i_\mu$	ψ^i_μ	$P_L\psi^i_\mu \;=\; \psi^i_\mu$	**4**	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
$v_{\mu i}{}^j$	$V_{\mu j}{}^i$	$V_{\mu i}{}^i \;=\; 0$	**15**	0	0

Table 2: *The multiplet of currents and their corresponding gauge/matter fields for $\mathcal{N} = 4$ conformal supergravity. The third column shows some properties of the gauge fields derived from the properties of the currents, the fourth column gives the representation of the fields with respect to the R-symmetry group* SU(4)*, and the fifth and sixth column respectively give the Weyl and chiral weights of the gauge/matter fields.*

where $\mathcal{L}_{\rm matter}$ contains the matter fields discussed before, $\omega_\mu{}^{ab}$ is the spin connection, b_μ is the dilatational gauge field, f_μ^a is the gauge field associated to the special conformal symmetry and finally ϕ_μ^i is the analog of the gravitino related to the fermionic S^i symmetries. The reason that these gauge fields do not appear is because we work in the second order formalism[7]. In this formalism one imposes constraints on the curvatures that ensure the graviton, the gravitino and the R-symmetry gauge fields to be the only independent fields resulting from the algebra. The other fields are thus composites of the independent fields. An important motivation for these constraints is that they reconcile general coordinate transformations with gauged translations. The constraints that are conventionally used for this procedure are

$$R_{\mu\nu}(P^a)=0, \quad e_b^\nu \hat{R}_{\mu\nu}(M^{ab})=0 \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma^\nu \hat{R}_{\mu\nu}(Q^i)=0. \tag{2.26}$$

The hats on top of the curvatures imply that they are dependent on the matter fields in the multiplet as well. The way that one determines these curvatures and the gauging of the Poincaré group is explained in more detail in [47] chapter 11. A discussion on the curvature constraints is given in chapter 16 of the same book.

The independent components of the gauge fields are listed in Table 3. The mentioned curvature constraints have already been imposed and the redundant gauge degrees of freedom have been subtracted in this component counting. The table also clearly shows that in the case of $\mathcal{N}>1$ one has to include matter fields in the full multiplet to ensure that the number of fermionic and bosonic components are equal.

Up to overall normalization the linear supersymmetry variations of the Weyl multiplet are found by imposing supersymmetric invariance of the action associated to (2.25). The variations are of the following form

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_Q(\epsilon)e_\mu^a =&\frac{1}{2}\bar{\epsilon}^i\gamma^a\psi_{\mu i}+\text{h.c.},\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)\psi_\mu^i =&D_\mu\epsilon^i-\frac{1}{4}\gamma^{ab}T_{ab}^{ij}\gamma_\mu\epsilon_j,\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)V_{\mu j}{}^i =&\bar{\epsilon}^i\phi_{\mu j}+\frac{1}{2}\bar{\epsilon}_k\gamma_\mu\chi_{kj}^i-\frac{1}{4}\delta_j^i\bar{\epsilon}^k\phi_{\mu k}-\text{h.c.},\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)C =&\frac{1}{2}\bar{\epsilon}^i\Lambda_i,\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)\Lambda_i =&\not{D}C\epsilon_i+\frac{1}{2}E_{ij}\epsilon^j+\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{ijk\ell}\gamma^{ab}T_{ab}^{k\ell}\epsilon^j,\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)E_{ij} =&\bar{\epsilon}_{(i}\not{D}\Lambda_{j)}-\bar{\epsilon}^k\chi_{(i}^{mn}\varepsilon_{j)kmn},\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)T_{ab}^{ij} =&2\bar{\epsilon}^{[i}(\partial_{[a}\psi_{b]}^{j]}-\gamma_{[a}\phi_{b]}^{j]})+\frac{1}{4}\bar{\epsilon}_k\gamma_{ab}\chi_k^{ij}+\frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^{ijk\ell}\bar{\epsilon}_k\not{D}\gamma_{ab}\Lambda_\ell,\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)\chi_k^{ij} =&-\frac{1}{4}\gamma^{ab}\not{D}T_{ab}^{ij}\epsilon_k-\frac{1}{6}\gamma^{ab}\not{D}\delta_k^{[i}T_{ab}^{j]\ell}\epsilon_\ell-\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ij\ell m}\not{D}E_{k\ell}\epsilon_m+\frac{1}{2}D_{k\ell}^{ij}\epsilon^\ell\\
&-\frac{1}{2}\gamma^{ab}R_{ab}(V_k{}^{[i})\epsilon^{j]}-\frac{1}{6}\gamma^{ab}\delta_k^{[i}R_{ab}(V_\ell{}^{j]})\epsilon^\ell-\text{trace},
\end{aligned}$$

[7]Except the dilatational gauge field. This field, however, decouples from the rest because the SYM theory, from which we started, is a conformal theory. We will reintroduce this field in a later stage.

Transformation	Generator	Parameter	Gauge field	Independent components
Translation	P_a	ζ_a	e_μ^a	5
Lorentz boosts	M_{ab}	λ_{ab}	$\omega_\mu{}^{ab}$	composite
Dilatations	D	λ_D	b_μ	0
Special conformal	K_a	λ_K^a	$f_\mu{}^a$	composite
Chiral $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{N})$	$U_i{}^j$	$\lambda_i{}^j$	$V_{\mu j}{}^i$	$3(\mathcal{N}^2-1)$
Chiral $\mathrm{U}(1)$	T	λ_T	$\mathcal{A}_\mu$	3
Supersymmetry	Q^i	ϵ_i	ψ_μ^i	$12\mathcal{N}$
Special supersymmetry	S^i	η_i	ϕ_μ^i	composite

Table 3: *The symmetries of the superconformal group in four dimensions* $\mathrm{SU}(2,2|\mathcal{N})$*, their generators, parameters and gauge fields. The final column denotes the number of independent components of the gauge fields.*

$$\delta_Q(\epsilon) D^{ij}_{k\ell} = -2(\bar\epsilon^{[i} \not\partial \chi^{j]}_{k\ell} + \bar\epsilon^m \not\partial \delta^{[i}_{[k} \chi^{j]}_{\ell]m}) + \text{h.c.} - \text{trace}. \tag{2.27}$$

The linearized curvature of the R-symmetry is given by $R_{\mu\nu}(V_j{}^i) = 2\partial_{[\mu} V_{\nu]j}{}^i$. The composite gauge field ϕ^i_μ is the solution of the linearized form of the last of (2.26):

$$\phi^i_\mu = \frac{1}{4}(\gamma^{ab}\gamma_\mu - \frac{1}{3}\gamma_\mu\gamma^{ab})\partial_a \psi^i_b. \tag{2.28}$$

The parts of the variations not related to the matter fields do indeed correspond to what one would expect from general gauge theories, i.e.

$$\delta(\epsilon) A^A_\mu = \partial_\mu \epsilon^A + \epsilon^C B^B_\mu f_{BC}{}^A. \tag{2.29}$$

General gauge theories are explained in more detail in [47, chapter 11].

The matter field T^{ij}_{ab} is called the graviphoton, which is present in extended supergravity theory. This reflects the fact that in the super-Poincaré theory, obtained after gauge fixing the superconformal theory, this field contains the field strengths of the 6 spin-1 fields that are part of the gravity multiplet.

For $\mathcal{N} = 4$, the R-symmetry group in the minimal conformal superalgebra is reduced from $\mathrm{U}(4) = \mathrm{SU}(4)\times\mathrm{U}(1)$ to $\mathrm{SU}(4)$. See the remark after (2.10). It is only this simple algebra without the T-symmetry that is gauged here. However, this multiplet allows a consistent assignment of chiral weights. The corresponding symmetry is not gauged so far, though we will come back to its gauging in Sec. 2.3. The Weyl and chiral weights of the different fields, which are mentioned in Table 2, can be found by stating the weights of the frame field and supersymmetry parameter:

$$w(e^a_\mu) = -1, \qquad w(\epsilon^i) = -\frac{1}{2}, \qquad c(e^a_\mu) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad c(\epsilon^i) = \frac{1}{2} = -c(\epsilon_i), \tag{2.30}$$

and applying the superconformal algebra to find the weights of the other fields.

2.3 The nonlinear variations of the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Weyl multiplet

The next step in constructing the nonlinear supersymmetry variations consists in the covariantization of the linear ones.[8] This comes down to a three step procedure:

1. make the parameters local: $\epsilon \to \epsilon(x)$,
2. change derivatives into covariant derivatives: $\partial_\mu \to D_\mu$,
3. replace all derivatives of gauge fields with curvatures: $\partial_{[\mu} A_{\nu]} \to \frac{1}{2} R_{\mu\nu}(A)$.

Note that the final step was already applied to the gauge field of the R-symmetry. After the covariantization one has to make an ansatz concerning the nonlinear terms in the variations. These terms have to be consistent with the representations and the Weyl and chiral weights

[8] Details of this procedure have been discussed in [34, sec. 2].

of the different fields. The consistency with SU(4) means that the indices of the fields need to be correctly contracted on the right-hand side of the variations such that they match the indices on the left hand side. The terms in the right-hand side will also have to be combined in such a way that the sums of the Weyl and chiral weights of the fields and derivatives equal those of the Weyl and chiral weight of the field in the left-hand side of the variation. Finally, the coefficients appearing in front of the nonlinear terms have to be determined by imposing the soft algebra relations of the superconformal group:

$$\begin{aligned}[\delta_Q(\epsilon_1), \delta_Q(\epsilon_2)] &= \delta_P(\xi) - \delta_{\text{gauge}}(\theta), \\ [\delta_Q(\epsilon), \delta_S(\eta)] &= \delta_D(\lambda_D) + \delta_M(\lambda^{ab}) + \delta_{\text{SU(4)}}(\lambda_j{}^i) - \delta_{\text{gauge}}(\tilde{\theta})\,,\end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

where the δ_{gauge} terms are all the variations except for the covariant general coordinate transformations. The parameters of these variations depend as well on the matter fields in the multiplet as on the two infinitesimal parameters in the left hand side of the equation. The reason that the algebras deform like this is that the left hand side is a covariant quantity but the δ_P-term is not. A gauge transformation of such a δ_P-term would include derivatives of the gauge parameters. The exact form of the parameters in a soft algebra have to be determined by looking at the action of the commutator on the different fields. They should give consistent terms with respect to the SU(4) and Lorentz representations of the different fields.

The chiral symmetry that was so far only a rigid symmetry can be extended to a local symmetry, using a rewriting of the scalar field C of the Weyl multiplet. The complex scalar C describes the coset space $\text{SU}(1,1)/\,\text{U}(1)$. It is a projective coordinate of the coset space. The authors of [31] have then replaced the complex field C by a complex constrained doublet $\{\Phi_\alpha\} = \{\Phi_1, \Phi_2\}$ with $|\Phi_1|^2 - |\Phi_2|^2 = 1$, describing the full coset space:

$$\Phi_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-|C|^2}}, \qquad \Phi_2 = \frac{C}{\sqrt{1-|C|^2}}. \tag{2.32}$$

These fields have one extra gauge degree of freedom, for which there is a local U(1) gauge group, allowing to take Φ_1 real to return to the formulation in terms of C. However, this local U(1) can be maintained and coupled to the T-symmetry. Reformulating the theory with these fields and the extra local symmetry is a useful step because the formulation with the U(1) symmetry puts strong restrictions on the nonlinear supersymmetry transformations. For more information on the coset description with the complex scalar C one is referred to [49]. In [50] it is explained how a formulation with the fields Φ_α allows to assign also consistent chiral weights to the fields of the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super-Yang–Mills multiplet.

This U(1) symmetry will, however, not be present in the case when the superconformal group is truncated to the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ case. The reason is that the complex scalar describing this coset will vanish in the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ Weyl multiplet. This is easily understood when one knows that this complex scalar has the Young-diagram

$$\begin{array}{|c|}\hline\\\hline\\\hline\\\hline\\\hline\end{array} \simeq C^{[ijkl]} \simeq C \tag{2.33}$$

with respect to the R-symmetry group SU(4). This goes to zero when the group is truncated to $\mathrm{SU}(3)\times\mathrm{U}(1)$. However, in this case we obtain the usual U(1) chiral symmetry originating from the R-symmetry group.

The full nonlinear variations of the Weyl multiplet were found in [31] and are given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)e_\mu^a =&\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^i\gamma^a\psi_{\mu i}+\text{h.c.},\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)\psi_\mu^i =&D_\mu\epsilon^i-\frac{1}{4}\gamma^{ab}T_{ab}^{ij}\gamma_\mu\epsilon_j-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ijk\ell}\Lambda_\ell\overline{\epsilon}_j\psi_{\mu k}-\gamma_\mu\eta^i,\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)V_{\mu j}{}^i =&\overline{\epsilon}^i\phi_{\mu j}+\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^k\gamma_\mu\chi_{kj}^i-\frac{1}{4}E^{ik}\varepsilon_{jkmn}\overline{\epsilon}^m\psi_\mu^n-\frac{1}{12}E^{ik}\overline{\epsilon}_j\gamma_\mu\Lambda_k\\
&+\frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^{ik\ell m}\overline{\epsilon}_k\gamma_{ab}T_{\ell j}^{ab}\gamma_\mu\Lambda_m+\frac{1}{6}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}\overline{\epsilon}^i\gamma_\mu\Phi^\alpha\not{D}\Phi^\beta\Lambda_j\\
&\frac{3}{4}\delta_{jmn}^{ik\ell}\overline{\epsilon}^m\gamma_a\psi_{\mu k}\overline{\Lambda}_\ell\gamma_a\Lambda^n-\overline{\psi}_\mu^i\eta_j-\text{h.c.}-\text{trace},\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)\Phi_\alpha =&-\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^i\Lambda_i\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}\Phi^\beta,\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)\Lambda_i =&\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\Phi_\alpha\not{D}\Phi_\beta\epsilon_i+\frac{1}{2}E_{ij}\epsilon^j+\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{ijk\ell}\gamma^{ab}T_{ab}^{k\ell}\epsilon^j,\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)E_{ij} =&\overline{\epsilon}_{(i}\not{D}\Lambda_{j)}-\overline{\epsilon}^k\chi_{(i}^{mn}\varepsilon_{j)kmn}-\frac{1}{2}\overline{\Lambda}_i\Lambda_j\overline{\epsilon}_k\Lambda^k+\overline{\Lambda}_k\Lambda_{(i}\overline{\epsilon}_{j)}\Lambda^k+\frac{1}{2}\overline{\eta}_{(i}\Lambda_{j)},\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)T_{ab}^{ij} =&\overline{\epsilon}^{[i}\hat{R}_{ab}^{j]}(Q)+\frac{1}{4}\overline{\epsilon}^k\gamma_{ab}\chi_k^{ij}+\frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^{ijk\ell}\overline{\epsilon}_k\not{D}\gamma_{ab}\Lambda_\ell-\frac{1}{12}E^{k[i}\overline{\epsilon}^{j]}\gamma_{ab}\Lambda_k\\
&-\frac{1}{6}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\overline{\epsilon}^{[i}\gamma_{ab}\Phi_\alpha\not{D}\Phi_\beta\Lambda^{j]}-\frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^{ijk\ell}\overline{\eta}_k\gamma_{ab}\Lambda_\ell,\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)\chi_k^{ij} =&-\frac{1}{4}\gamma^{ab}\not{D}T_{ab}^{ij}\epsilon_k-\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ij\ell m}\not{D}E_{k\ell}\epsilon_m+\frac{1}{2}D_{k\ell}^{ij}\epsilon^\ell-\frac{1}{2}\gamma^{ab}\hat{R}_{ab}(V_k{}^{[i})\epsilon^{j]}\\
&+\frac{1}{4}E_{k\ell}E^{\ell[i}\epsilon^{j]}-\frac{1}{12}\gamma^{ab}\varepsilon_{k\ell mn}E^{\ell[i}(T_{ab}^{j]n}\epsilon^m+T_{ab}^{mn}\epsilon^{j]})\\
&+\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ij\ell m}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\Phi_\alpha\not{D}\Phi_\beta\gamma_{ab}T_{k\ell}^{ab}\epsilon_m+\frac{1}{2}\gamma^a\epsilon_n(\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ij\ell n}\overline{\chi}_{\ell k}^m-\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ij\ell m}\overline{\chi}_{\ell k}^n)\gamma_a\Lambda_m\\
&+\frac{1}{4}\epsilon^{[i}(\overline{\Lambda}^{j]}\not{D}\Lambda_k+\frac{1}{2}\overline{\Lambda}_k\not{D}\Lambda^{j]})-\frac{1}{4}\gamma^{ab}\epsilon^{[i}(\overline{\Lambda}^{j]}\gamma_aD_b\Lambda_k-\frac{1}{2}\overline{\Lambda}_k\gamma_aD_b\Lambda^{j]})\\
&+\frac{1}{4},\epsilon^{[i}\overline{\Lambda}^{j]}\Lambda^m\overline{\Lambda}_k\Lambda_m-\frac{1}{24}\varepsilon^{ij\ell m}\Lambda_m(5\overline{\epsilon}_\ell(E_{kn}\Lambda^n+2\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}\Phi^\alpha\not{D}\Phi^\beta\Lambda_k)\\
&-\overline{\epsilon}_k(E_{\ell n}\Lambda^n+2\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}\Phi^\alpha\not{D}\Phi^\beta\Lambda_\ell))-\frac{1}{4}\gamma^{ab}T_{ab}^{ij}\gamma_c\epsilon_{[k}\overline{\Lambda}^\ell\gamma^c\Lambda_{\ell]}\\
&-\frac{1}{8}\gamma^{ab}T_{ab}^{\ell[i}\gamma_c\epsilon_{[k}\overline{\Lambda}^{j]}\gamma^c\Lambda_{\ell]}+\frac{1}{4}\gamma^{ab}T_{ab}^{ij}\eta_k+\frac{1}{6}\gamma^{ab}\delta_k^{[i}T_{ab}^{j]\ell}\eta_\ell\\
&-\frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^{ij\ell m}E_{k\ell}\eta_m-\frac{1}{16}\gamma_a\eta^{[j}\overline{\Lambda}_k\gamma^a\Lambda^{i]}+\frac{1}{24}\gamma^a\delta_k^{[i}\eta^{j]}\overline{\Lambda}_\ell\gamma_a\Lambda^\ell\\
&-\frac{1}{24}\gamma^a\eta^\ell\overline{\Lambda}_\ell\gamma_a\delta_k^{[i}\Lambda^{j]}-\text{trace}\,,\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)D_{k\ell}^{ij} =&-2\overline{\epsilon}^{[i}\not{D}\chi_{k\ell}^{j]}+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ijmn}\overline{\epsilon}^pT_{abk\ell}(2T_{np}^{ab}\Lambda_m+T_{mn}^{ab}\Lambda_p)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{k\ell mn}\overline{\epsilon}^{[i}(-4E^{j]p}\chi_p^{mn}+\gamma^{ab}T_{ab}^{mn}\overleftrightarrow{\not{D}}\Lambda^{j]}+\frac{2}{3}E^{j]m}E^{np}\Lambda_p\\
&+\frac{4}{3}E^{j]n}\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\Phi_\alpha\not{D}\Phi_\beta\Lambda^m\\
&+\gamma^{ab}T_{ab}^{mn}\Lambda_p\overline{\Lambda}^{j]}\Lambda^p)+\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^{[i}(2\gamma_a\chi_{k\ell}^m\overline{\Lambda}^{j]}\gamma^a\Lambda_m\\
&-2\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\Phi_\alpha\not{D}\Phi_\beta\gamma_{ab}\Lambda^{j]}T_{k\ell}^{ab}+\frac{1}{3}\Lambda_{[k}E_{\ell]m}\overline{\Lambda}_{j]}\Lambda^m\\
&+\frac{1}{6}\gamma_{ab}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}\Phi^\alpha\not{D}\Phi^\beta\Lambda^{j]}\overline{\Lambda}_k\gamma^{ab}\Lambda_\ell)-\text{trace}+\text{h.c.}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.34}
$$

The soft algebra of $\mathcal{N}=4$ conformal supergravity is of the following form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
[\delta_Q(\epsilon_1),\delta_Q(\epsilon_2)]=&\delta_{cgct}(\xi^\mu)+\delta_M(\lambda_1^{ab})+\delta_Q(\epsilon_3^i)\\
&+\delta_S(\eta_1^i)+\delta_{\mathrm{SU}(4)}(\lambda_{1j}{}^i)+\delta_{\mathrm{U}(1)}(\lambda_T)+\delta_K(\lambda_{1K}^a),\\
[\delta_Q(\epsilon),\delta_S(\eta)]=&\delta_D(\lambda_D)+\delta_M(\lambda_2^{ab})+\delta_S(\eta_2^i)+\delta_{\mathrm{SU}(4)}(\lambda_{2j}{}^i)+\delta_K(\lambda_{2K}^a).
\end{aligned}
\tag{2.35}
$$

As was discussed in the preceding paragraph, the parameters in a soft algebra are dependent on the fields in the multiplet. These parameters are given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\xi^\mu=&\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}_1^i\gamma^\mu\epsilon_{2i}+\text{h.c.},\\
\lambda_1^{ab}=&\overline{\epsilon}_1^i\epsilon_2^jT_{abij}+\text{h.c.},\\
\lambda_2^{ab}=&-\frac{1}{2}\overline{\eta}_i\gamma^{ab}\epsilon^i+\text{h.c.},\\
\epsilon_3^i=&\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ijkl}\overline{\epsilon}_{1k}\epsilon_{2l}\Lambda_j,\\
\eta_1^i=&-\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}_1^k\epsilon_2^\ell\chi_{k\ell}^i-\frac{1}{8}(\overline{\epsilon}_2^k\gamma_a\epsilon_{1j}+\text{h.c.})(\gamma^a\chi_k^{ij}+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ij\ell m}\gamma_{bc}T_{km}^{bc}\gamma^a\Lambda_l)\\
&-\frac{1}{48}(\overline{\epsilon}_2^i\gamma_a\epsilon_{1j}-\delta_j^i\overline{\epsilon}_2^\ell\gamma_a\epsilon_{1\ell}+\text{h.c.})\gamma^a(E^{jk}\Lambda_k-2\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}\Phi_\alpha\not{D}\Phi_\beta\Lambda^j)\\
&+\frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^{ijk\ell}\overline{\epsilon}_{1k}\epsilon_{2\ell}\not{D}\Lambda_j+\frac{1}{12}\overline{\epsilon}_2^{[i}\epsilon_1^{j]}(E_{jk}\Lambda^k+2\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}\Phi^\alpha\not{D}\Phi^\beta\Lambda_j),\\
\eta_2^i=&-\frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^{ijk\ell}\overline{\eta}_k\gamma_a\epsilon_j\gamma^a\Lambda_\ell,\\
\lambda_{1j}{}^i=&\frac{1}{4}E^{ik}\varepsilon_{k\ell mj}\overline{\epsilon}_2^\ell\epsilon_1^m+\frac{1}{8}(\overline{\epsilon}_2^k\gamma^a\epsilon_{1j}+\text{h.c.})\overline{\Lambda}^i\gamma_a\Lambda_k-\frac{1}{16}(\overline{\epsilon}_2^k\gamma_a\epsilon_{1k}+\text{h.c.})\overline{\Lambda}^i\gamma^a\Lambda_j\\
&-\frac{1}{16}(\overline{\epsilon}_2^i\gamma_a\epsilon_{1j}+\text{h.c.})\overline{\Lambda}^k\gamma^a\Lambda_k-\text{h.c.}-\text{trace},\\
\lambda_{2j}{}^i=&-\overline{\epsilon}^i\eta_j+\frac{1}{4}\delta_j^i\overline{\epsilon}^k\eta_k-\text{h.c.},\\
\lambda_T=&-\frac{1}{8}(\overline{\epsilon}_1^i\gamma_a\epsilon_{1j}+\text{h.c.})(\overline{\Lambda}^j\gamma^a\Lambda_i-\delta_i^j\overline{\Lambda}^k\gamma^a\Lambda_k),\\
\lambda_D=&\frac{1}{2}(\overline{\epsilon}^i\eta_i+h.c.),
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda^a_{1K} =& \frac{1}{6}\bar{\epsilon}_{2i}\gamma^b\epsilon_1^j\hat{R}_{ab}(V_j{}^i) + \frac{2}{3}\bar{\epsilon}_2^i\epsilon_1^j D_b T_{ij}^{ab} + \frac{1}{8}\bar{\epsilon}_{1i}\gamma_{bc}T_{jk}^{bc}\gamma^a\gamma^{de}T_{de}^{ij}\epsilon_1^k \\
& - \frac{1}{12}\bar{\epsilon}_{2i}\gamma_b\epsilon_1^i\varepsilon^{abcd}(D_c\Phi^\alpha D_d\Phi_\alpha - \frac{1}{4}(\overline{\Lambda}^j\gamma_c D_d\Lambda_j - \text{h.c.})) + \text{h.c.}, \\
\lambda^a_{2K} =& \frac{1}{12}\overline{\eta}_i\gamma^{bc}T_{bc}^{ij}\gamma^a\epsilon_j + \text{h.c.}\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.36}
$$

This algebra is an extension of $\mathfrak{su}(2,2|4)$ since it reduces to the latter upon putting the fields of the Weyl multiplet to zero.

3 The $\mathcal{N}=3$ Weyl multiplet

3.1 The truncation to $\mathcal{N}=3$ extended conformal supergravity

In this section the construction of the Weyl multiplet for $\mathcal{N}=3$ supergravity in four dimensions will be discussed. The construction is based on the breaking of the supersymmetric conformal group SU(2, 2|4) into SU(2, 2|3). This breaking will happen in three steps. Firstly one supersymmetry parameter, ϵ_4, is set to zero and secondly the appropriate field components of the $\mathcal{N}=4$ Weyl multiplet will have to be found that keep an $\mathcal{N}=3$ symmetry after the truncation. Finally, the variations of the fields in the new representation are derived. Deriving the explicit supersymmetry variations will be the subject of the next section.

In our truncation we will find that the R-symmetry group breaks from SU(4) to SU(3) × U(1). This means that the Latin indices used in the previous section will not run from 1 to 4 anymore, but from 1 to 3. We choose the following convention for the Levi-Civita tensor:

$$
\varepsilon_{ijk} := \varepsilon_{ijk4}. \tag{3.1}
$$

To make the theory consistent, a subset of currents of the known $\mathcal{N}=4$ theory has to be found that transform internally under the variations given in (2.22), when this ϵ_4 is indeed set to zero. We propose the following subset:

$$
\text{Weyl}_c(\mathcal{N}=3) = \{e_i, \lambda_{R,L}, t_i^{ab}, d_{k\ell}^{ij}, \xi_k^{ij}, \Theta_{\mu\nu}, \mathcal{J}_{\mu i}, v_{\mu j}{}^i\}\,, \qquad i=1,2,3. \tag{3.2}
$$

Here we have defined the following currents:

$$
e_i := e_{i4}, \quad \lambda_R := \lambda_4, \quad \lambda_L := \lambda^4 \quad \text{and} \quad t_i^{ab} := t_{i4}^{ab}. \tag{3.3}
$$

The left over currents are now given by

$$
\text{Weyl}_c(\mathcal{N}=4)/\text{Weyl}_c(\mathcal{N}=3) = \{c, e_{ij}, e_{44}, \lambda_i, t_{ij}^{ab}, d_{k4}^{ij}, \xi_k^{i4}, \xi_4^{ij}, \mathcal{J}_{\mu 4}, v_{\mu 4}{}^i\}. \tag{3.4}
$$

Note that this truncation is indeed a good guess at first sight because the number of fermionic components equals the number of bosonic components in $\text{Weyl}_c(\mathcal{N}=3)$, namely $64+64$. Furthermore, in [36, 37] a similar suggestion has been made for the representations present in the multiplet.

As was already expected we find that the R-symmetry group partially breaks from SU(4) to SU(3) $\times$ U(1). This is shown by the fact that the associated current acquires a trace after truncation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{4} v_{\mu i}{}^{i} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{i=1}^{3} v_{\mu i}{}^{i} = -v_{\mu 4}{}^{4} \neq 0. \tag{3.5}$$

The remaining currents are in representations of SU$(2,2|3)$. A result is that some of the currents now have redundant indices. Therefore the following redefinitions are introduced:

$$d_n^m := \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{mk\ell}\varepsilon_{nij}d_{k\ell}^{ij}, \qquad \xi_{k\ell} := \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{\ell ij}\xi_k^{ij}. \tag{3.6}$$

Also these currents have different trace properties from their corresponding currents in the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ case:

$$d_n^n = 0, \qquad \varepsilon^{ijk}\xi_{ij} \neq 0. \tag{3.7}$$

These properties are consistent with the supersymmetry variations because

$$\delta_Q(\epsilon)d_n^n = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_Q(\epsilon)\varepsilon^{ijk}\xi_{ij} \neq 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Note that ξ_{ij} has a symmetric and an anti-symmetric part. In a later stage we will split the corresponding matter field in a symmetric and anti-symmetric part. Moreover, the λ-current has become an SU(3) scalar and thus there is an ambiguity in the notation concerning the chirality of the spinor. To indicate the chirality of the spinor we use subscripts L or R:

$$\lambda_L := P_L\lambda, \qquad \lambda_R := P_R\lambda. \tag{3.9}$$

All the currents, their corresponding gauge fields and their properties are summarized in Table 5. The linear supersymmetry transformations of these currents are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_Q(\epsilon)\lambda_R =& \frac{1}{2}\not{\partial}e_i\epsilon^i - \frac{1}{4}\gamma_{ab}(\not{\partial}t_i^{ab})\epsilon^i,\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)e_i =& \frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}_i\lambda_R - \frac{4\mathrm{i}}{3}\overline{\epsilon}^j\not{\partial}\xi_{ij} + \frac{2\mathrm{i}}{3}\overline{\epsilon}^j\not{\partial}\xi_{ji},\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)t_i^{ab} =& \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{ijk}\overline{\epsilon}^j\gamma^{[a}\mathcal{J}^{b]k} + \frac{1}{4}\overline{\epsilon}_i\gamma^{ab}\lambda_R - \frac{\mathrm{i}}{3}\overline{\epsilon}^j\gamma^{ab}\xi_{ji},\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)\xi_{ij} =& -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{8}(\frac{1}{2}\gamma_{ab}t_i^{ab}\epsilon_j + \gamma_{ab}t_j^{ab}\epsilon_i + 3\varepsilon_{jk\ell}\gamma^\mu v_{\mu i}{}^k\epsilon^\ell - \varepsilon_{ijk}\gamma^\mu v_{\mu\ell}{}^k\epsilon^\ell\\
& - 3e_i\epsilon_j + 6\varepsilon_{ik\ell}\not{\partial}d_j^k\epsilon^\ell),\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)d_n^m =& \frac{\mathrm{i}}{3}\varepsilon^{mk\ell}(\overline{\epsilon}_k\xi_{\ell n} + \overline{\epsilon}_n\xi_{\ell k}) + \text{h.c.},\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)\Theta_{\mu\nu} =& -\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^k\gamma_{\lambda(\mu}\partial^\lambda\mathcal{J}_{\nu)k} + \text{h.c.},\\
\delta_Q(\epsilon)\mathcal{J}_{\mu i} =& -\frac{1}{2}\gamma^\nu\Theta_{\mu\nu}\epsilon_i - \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^\rho\gamma_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{3}\gamma_{\mu\nu}\gamma^\rho)\partial^\nu v_{\rho i}{}^j\epsilon_j
\end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ijk}(\gamma^{ab}\gamma_{\mu\nu}+\frac{1}{3}\gamma_{\mu\nu}\gamma^{ab})\partial^\nu t^j_{ab}\epsilon^k,$$
$$\delta_Q(\epsilon)v_{\mu j}{}^i = -\frac{1}{2}\bar\epsilon^i\mathcal{J}_{\mu j}+\frac{1}{8}\delta^i_j\bar\epsilon^k\mathcal{J}_{\mu k}-\frac{2\mathrm{i}}{3}\varepsilon_{jkl}\bar\epsilon^k\gamma_{\mu\lambda}\partial^\lambda\xi^{il}-\text{h.c.}. \tag{3.10}$$

The coefficients of the different terms have been checked on consistency with the algebra. Namely, the following commutator, when acting on the currents, has been calculated in this procedure:

$$[\delta(\epsilon_1),\delta(\epsilon_2)] = \frac{1}{2}\bar\epsilon^i_2\gamma^\mu\epsilon_{1i}P_\mu+\text{h.c.}. \tag{3.11}$$

Because we are interested in the irreducible representations of the symmetry group we split up the R-current in a traceless part and an SU(3) scalar, namely:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_Q(\epsilon)v_{\mu j}{}^i &= -\frac{1}{2}\bar\epsilon^i\mathcal{J}_{\mu j}+\frac{1}{8}\delta^i_j\bar\epsilon^k\mathcal{J}_{\mu k}-\frac{2\mathrm{i}}{3}\varepsilon_{jkl}\bar\epsilon^k\gamma_{\mu\nu}\partial^\nu\xi^{il}-\text{h.c.}-\text{trace},\\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)a_\mu &= -\frac{3}{8}\bar\epsilon^i\mathcal{J}_{\mu i}+2\mathrm{i}\varepsilon_{ikl}\bar\epsilon^k\gamma_{\mu\nu}\partial^\nu\xi^{il}-\text{h.c.},\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where the trace is now defined as $a_\mu := -3\sum_{i=1}^3 v_{\mu i}{}^i$.

A final check that had to be made to ensure that this multiplet is indeed correct with respect to the symmetry group SU(2, 2|3) was to see if the remaining currents do not act as a source. In other words: to check if the splitting of fields that happens through the truncation really results in two disjoint multiplets. This was indeed the case, it was found that the variations of the currents in (3.4), when $\epsilon_4 = 0$, are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_Q(\epsilon)c &= \bar\epsilon_i\not\partial\lambda^i\\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)e_{ij} &= \bar\epsilon_{(i}\lambda_{j)}+\frac{4\mathrm{i}}{3}\varepsilon_{4kl(i}\bar\epsilon^l\not\partial\xi^{4k}_{j)},\\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)e_{44} &= \frac{4\mathrm{i}}{3}\varepsilon_{ijk4}\bar\epsilon^k\not\partial\xi^{ij}_4,\\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)\lambda_i &= \frac{1}{2}c^*\epsilon_i+\frac{1}{2}\not\partial e_{ij}\epsilon^j-\frac{1}{4}\gamma_{ab}\not\partial t^{ab}_{ij}\epsilon^j,\\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)\xi^{i4}_j &= \frac{3\mathrm{i}}{16}\varepsilon^{i4kl}\gamma_{ab}t^{ab}_{jk}\epsilon_l+\frac{3\mathrm{i}}{8}\varepsilon^{i4kl}e_{jk}\epsilon_l+\frac{3\mathrm{i}}{8}\gamma^\mu v_{\mu j}{}^4\epsilon^i+\frac{3\mathrm{i}}{4}\not\partial d^{jk}_{i4}\epsilon^k-\text{trace},\\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)\xi^{ij}_4 &= \frac{3\mathrm{i}}{4}(\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ij4k}e_{44}\epsilon_k-\gamma^\mu v_{\mu4}{}^{[i}\epsilon^{j]}+\not\partial d^{ij}_{4k}\epsilon^k),\\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)t^{ij}_{ab} &= \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ijk4}\bar\epsilon_k\gamma_{[a}\mathcal{J}_{b]4}-\frac{1}{2}\bar\epsilon^{[i}\gamma_{ab}\lambda^{j]}+\frac{\mathrm{i}}{3}\varepsilon^{ijk4}\bar\epsilon_l\not\partial\gamma_{ab}\xi^l_{k4},\\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)v_{\mu i}{}^4 &= \frac{2\mathrm{i}}{3}\bar\epsilon^j\gamma_{\mu\nu}\partial^\nu\xi^4_{ji},\\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)d^{i4}_{jk} &= \frac{4\mathrm{i}}{3}\bar\epsilon_{[j}\xi^{i4}_{k]}+\frac{2\mathrm{i}}{3}\bar\epsilon_l\delta^i_{[j}\xi^{4l}_{k]}+\text{h.c.},\\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)\mathcal{J}_{\mu4} &= -\frac{1}{2}(\gamma^\rho\gamma_{\mu\nu}-\frac{1}{3}\gamma_{\mu\nu}\gamma^\rho)\partial^\nu v_{\rho4}{}^i\epsilon_i-\frac{1}{8}(\gamma^{ab}\gamma_{\mu\nu}+\frac{1}{3}\gamma_{\mu\nu}\gamma^{ab})\varepsilon_{4ijk}\partial^\nu t^{ij}_{ab}\epsilon^k.\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Hence, none of the currents in the $\mathcal{N}=3$ Weyl current multiplet are found in the right-hand side. This means that we can consistently put all of these currents to zero and conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_Q(\epsilon)\text{Weyl}_c(\mathcal{N}=3) &\subset \text{Weyl}_c(\mathcal{N}=3) \\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)\Big[\text{Weyl}_c(\mathcal{N}=4)/\text{Weyl}_c(\mathcal{N}=3)\Big] &\cap \text{Weyl}_c(\mathcal{N}=3) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

3.2 Components of the Weyl multiplet(s)

Now that we know the content of the $\mathcal{N}=3$ Weyl current-multiplet, we can determine the gauge and matter fields in the Weyl multiplet.

The Weyl multiplet is simply found by coupling a field to each of the currents, exactly as was already done in the case of $\mathcal{N}=4$ conformal supergravity. The first order action then looks like

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(\mathcal{N}=3) = \int \mathrm{d}^4x\; h_\mu^a \Theta_a^\mu + D_n^m d_m^n + \mathcal{A}_\mu a^\mu + V_{\mu j}{}^i v_i^{\mu j} + (E^i e_i + \\ \overline{\chi}^{ij}\xi_{ij} + \overline{\psi}_\mu^i \mathcal{J}_i^\mu + \overline{\Lambda}\lambda + T_{ab}^i t_i^{ab} + \text{h.c.}), \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

where $h_{\mu a}$ is again the linear part of the frame field $e_{\mu a}$. The Weyl multiplet is thus given by

$$\text{Weyl}(\mathcal{N}=3) = \{e_\mu^a,\ \psi_\mu^i,\ D_n^m,\ \mathcal{A}_\mu,\ V_{\mu j}{}^i,\ E_i,\ \chi_{ij},\ \Lambda_L,\ T_{ab}^i\}. \tag{3.16}$$

These fields are consistent with earlier suggestions made for the $\mathcal{N}=3$ Weyl multiplet in [36, 37], similar to the case of the current multiplet.

Because the current ξ_{ij} consisted of a symmetric and anti-symmetric part, so will χ_{ij}. We will, however, prefer to work with irreducible representations and therefore split the two parts:

$$\chi_{ij} \equiv \chi_{(ij)} + \varepsilon_{ijk}\zeta^k. \tag{3.17}$$

In terms of representations this comes down to the decomposition $\mathbf{3}\otimes\mathbf{3} = \mathbf{6}\oplus\mathbf{3}$. In the future we will omit the symmetrization brackets, i.e.: $\chi_{ij} := \chi_{(ij)}$.

Now that we know what the components are of the $\mathcal{N}=3$ Weyl multiplet we are able to summarize all the known Weyl multiplets in four dimensions. More information on the different multiplets can be found in [31, 51, 36, 37]. The different known Weyl multiplets in four dimensions, varying from $\mathcal{N}=4$ to $\mathcal{N}=1$ are listed in Table 4. This table is an extension of Table 1 given in the introduction. Here the representations are further split into $\text{SU}(\mathcal{N})$ representations, which correspond to the fields of the Weyl multiplets as e.g. for $\mathcal{N}=4$ in Table 2 and for $\mathcal{N}=3$ in Table 5. Note that Tables 2 and 5 offer more detailed information on the specific cases where $\mathcal{N}=4$ and $\mathcal{N}=3$ respectively. For example; the current multiplets and conformal weights of the different fields in the mentioned cases are also given in these tables.

field	#states	$\mathcal{N}=4$		$\mathcal{N}=3$		$\mathcal{N}=2$		$\mathcal{N}=1$	
		rep.	#states	rep.	#states	rep.	#states	rep.	#states
${e_\mu}^a$	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5
V_μ	3	(101) 15	45	(11) 8	24	(2) 3	9		
$\mathcal{A}_\mu$	3			1	3	1	3	1	3
T_{ab}	$3+3$	(010) 6	36	(10) 3	18	1	6		
D	1	(020) 20	20	(11) 8	8	1	1		
C	$1+1$	1	2						
E	$1+1$	(200) 10	20	(10) 3	6				
ψ_μ	$4+4$	(100) 4	32	(10) 3	24	(1) 2	16	1	8
χ	$2+2$	(110) 20	80	(20)+(01) 6+3	36	(1) 2	8		
Λ	$2+2$	(100) 4	16	1	4				
			$128+128$		$64+64$		$24+24$		$8+8$

Table 4: *Weyl multiplets, ordered according to massive spin. The names of the field contain only the spacetime indices, since the other indices depend on* $\mathcal{N}$*. The second column gives the off-shell number of components as representation of the little group* SU(2)*. Adding the representation content (counting double the fields reducible under* SU(2)*) agrees with the numbers in Table 1. For the nontrivial representations, also the Dynkin labels are given, which corresponds to the Young Tableaux (the i-th Dynkin label is the number of columns with i vertical boxes). The fields that have two parts in the second column have also the conjugate representation in* SU($\mathcal{N}$)

.

4 Supersymmetry transformations of the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ Weyl multiplet

To find the supersymmetry variations we will follow the same procedure as was applied in the case of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ conformal supergravity. This means that first the linear variations will be determined by imposing invariance of the first order action. In a second step these variations will be covariantized. Thereupon an ansatz for the nonlinear terms in the variations will be made such that the representations, Weyl weights and chiral weights are consistent. Finally, this will be checked for compatibility with the soft algebra, fixing the coefficients of the nonlinear terms.

4.1 The linear supersymmetry transformations

To find the linear supersymmetry transformations we impose invariance of the first order action, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \delta_Q(\epsilon) S_1(\mathcal{N}=3) = \delta_Q(\epsilon) \int d^4x\, h_\mu^a \Theta_a^\mu + D_n^m d_m^n + \mathcal{A}_\mu a^\mu + V_{\mu i}{}^j v_j^{\mu i} + (E^i e_i + \\ \overline{\chi}^{ij}\xi_{ij} + \overline{\zeta}^i \xi_i + \overline{\psi}_\mu^i \mathcal{J}_i^\mu + \overline{\Lambda}\lambda + T_{ab}^i t_i^{ab} + \text{h.c.}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

The linear supersymmetry variations of the gauge and matter fields in the multiplet are found to be

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_Q(\epsilon) e_\mu^a =& \frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^i \gamma^a \psi_{\mu i} + \text{h.c.}, \\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)\psi_\mu^i =& D_\mu \epsilon^i - \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ijk}\gamma_{ab} T_j^{ab}\gamma_\mu \epsilon_k, \\ \delta_Q(\epsilon) V_{\mu j}{}^i =& \overline{\epsilon}^i \phi_{\mu j} - \frac{1}{12}\overline{\epsilon}^i \gamma_\mu \zeta_j - \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{jk\ell}\overline{\epsilon}^k \gamma_\mu \chi^{i\ell} - \text{h.c.} - \text{trace}, \\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)\mathcal{A}_\mu =& \frac{1}{6}\mathrm{i}\overline{\epsilon}^i \phi_{\mu i} - \frac{1}{9}\mathrm{i}\epsilon^i \gamma_\mu \zeta_i + \text{h.c.}\,, \\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)\Lambda_L =& \frac{1}{2}E_i \epsilon^i + \frac{1}{4}\gamma_{ab} T_i^{ab}\epsilon^i, \\ \delta_Q(\epsilon) E_i =& \frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}_i \not{D}\Lambda_L + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ijk}\overline{\epsilon}^j \zeta^k + \frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^j \chi_{ij}, \\ \delta_Q(\epsilon) T_{ab}^i =& -\frac{1}{4}\overline{\epsilon}^i \not{D}\gamma_{ab}\Lambda_R - \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ijk}\overline{\epsilon}_j \hat{R}_{ab}(Q_k) - \frac{1}{4}\overline{\epsilon}_j \gamma_{ab}\chi^{ij} + \frac{1}{12}\varepsilon^{ijk}\overline{\epsilon}_j \gamma_{ab}\zeta_k, \\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)\chi_{ij} =& \frac{1}{4}\gamma_{ab}\not{D} T_{(i}^{ab}\epsilon_{j)} - \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{k\ell(i}\gamma^{ab}\hat{R}_{ab}(V_{j)}{}^\ell)\epsilon^k + \frac{1}{2}\not{D}E_{(i}\epsilon_{j)} - \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_{k\ell(i}D_{j)}^\ell \epsilon^k, \\ \delta_Q(\epsilon)\zeta^i =& \frac{3}{4}\varepsilon^{ijk}\not{D}E_j \epsilon_k + \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^{ijk}\gamma_{ab}\not{D}T_k^{ab}\epsilon_j + \frac{1}{16}\gamma^{ab}\hat{R}_{ab}(V_k{}^{[i})\epsilon^{k]} \\ & - \frac{3}{2}\gamma^{ab}\hat{R}_{ab}(\mathcal{A})\epsilon^i - \frac{1}{2}D_k^i \epsilon^k, \\ \delta_Q(\epsilon) D_n^m =& -\frac{3}{4}\overline{\epsilon}^m \not{D}\zeta_n + \frac{3}{4}\varepsilon_{ijn}\overline{\epsilon}^i \not{D}\chi^{jm} + \text{h.c.} - \text{trace}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

These variations have been checked on consistency with the algebra, i.e. with the relation

$$\{Q_{\alpha i}, Q^{\beta j}\} = -\frac{1}{2}\delta_i^j(\gamma^a)_\alpha{}^\beta P_a. \tag{4.3}$$

We have already covariantized the variations that were found from the current variations. Also the curvature constraints have been imposed, these constraints are the same as those in the $\mathcal{N}=4$ theory, namely (2.26). Note that in this derivation new normalizations have been taken for the fields such that these variations won't directly correspond to the ones found from the current variations. The reason for the new normalizations is simply that this avoids large fractional coefficients in front of the terms.

The next step is to derive the special supersymmetry transformations generated by S^i. This derivation is similar to the derivation of the Q-supersymmetry variations, the difference is that in this case the relations

$$\{Q_{i\alpha}, S^{j\beta}\} = -\frac{1}{2}\delta_i^j\delta_\alpha^\beta D - \frac{1}{4}\delta_i^j(\gamma^{ab})_\alpha{}^\beta M_{ab} + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{i}\delta_i^j\delta_\alpha^\beta T - \delta_\alpha^\beta U_i{}^j \tag{4.4}$$

are used to determine the coefficients in the variations. The non-trivial linear special supersymmetry variations are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_S(\eta)E_i &= \overline{\eta}_i\Lambda_L,\\
\delta_S(\eta)T^i_{ab} &= \frac{1}{2}\overline{\eta}^i\gamma_{ab}\Lambda_R,\\
\delta_S(\eta)\chi_{ij} &= -\frac{1}{2}\gamma_{ab}T^{ab}_{(i}\eta_{j)} + E_i\eta_j,\\
\delta_S(\eta)\zeta_i &= \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{ijk}\gamma^{ab}T^j_{ab}\eta^k + \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon_{ijk}E^j\eta^k,\\
\delta_S(\eta)V_{\mu j}{}^i &= -\overline{\psi}^i_\mu\eta_j - \text{trace} - \text{h.c.},\\
\delta_S(\eta)\mathcal{A}_\mu &= -\frac{1}{6}\mathrm{i}\overline{\psi}^i_\mu\eta_i + \text{h.c.},\\
\delta_S(\eta)\psi^i_\mu &= -\gamma_\mu\eta^i.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Note that so far the dilatational gauge field hasn't been mentioned. The reason that we do not find this gauge field in our procedure is that $\mathcal{N}=4$ super Yang-Mills in four dimensions is conformal. This conformal invariance makes the gauge field decouple from the rest of the multiplet, as was already mentioned before. Since our multiplet is a reduction from the $\mathcal{N}=4$ multiplet the dilatational gauge field is still decoupled from the rest and it has to be introduced manually. The supersymmetric transformations involving b_μ are easily found by using the algebra. Specifically, one will find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)b_\mu &= \frac{1}{2}(\overline{\epsilon}^i\phi_{\mu i} - \overline{\psi}^i_\mu\eta_i) + \text{h.c.}\,,\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)\psi^i_\mu|_b &= \frac{1}{2}b_\mu\epsilon^i\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Note that there will be no nonlinear terms that have to be introduced because the gauge field completely decouples from the matter fields.

Current	Gauge field	Properties	SU(3) repr.	Weyl weight	Chiral weight
λ_L	Λ_L	$P_L\Lambda = \Lambda_L$, $P_R\Lambda = \Lambda_R$	**1**	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2}$
e_i	E_i	complex	**3**	1	1
t^i_{ab}	T^i_{ab}	$\tilde{T}^i_{ab} = T^i_{ab}$	**3**	1	-1
ξ_{ij}	χ_{ij}	$P_L\chi_{ij} = \chi_{ij}$	**6**	$\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
ξ_i	ζ^i	$P_L\zeta^i = \chi^i$	**3**	$\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
d^m_n	D^m_n	$D^n_n = 0$	**8**	2	0
$\Theta_{\mu\nu}$	e^a_μ	frame field	**1**	-1	0
$\mathcal{J}^i_\mu$	ψ^i_μ	$P_L\psi^i_\mu = \psi^i_\mu$	**3**	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
${v_{\mu i}}^j$	${V_{\mu j}}^i$	${V_{\mu i}}^i = 0$	**8**	0	0
a_μ	$\mathcal{A}_\mu$	$\mathcal{A}_\mu \propto {V_{\mu 4}}^4$	**1**	0	0
$-$	b_μ	dilaton	**1**	0	0

Table 5: *The multiplet of currents and their corresponding gauge/matter fields for $\mathcal{N} = 3$ conformal supergravity. The third column shows some properties of the gauge fields derived from the properties of the currents, the fourth column gives the R-symmetry representation of the currents (and fields) and the fifth and sixth column respectively give the Weyl and chiral weights of the gauge/matter fields.*

4.2 The nonlinear supersymmetry transformations and the soft algebra

To find the nonlinear part of the supersymmetry variations one has to follow the same method as was described in the case of $\mathcal{N}=4$ conformal supergravity. A careful analysis results in the following nonlinear variations

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)e_\mu^a =&\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^i\gamma^a\psi_{\mu i}+\text{h.c.},\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)\psi_\mu^i =&D_\mu\epsilon^i-\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ijk}\gamma_{ab}T_j^{ab}\gamma_\mu\epsilon_k-\varepsilon^{ijk}\overline{\epsilon}_j\psi_{\mu k}\Lambda_L-\gamma_\mu\eta^i,\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)V_{\mu j}{}^i =&\overline{\epsilon}^i\phi_{\mu j}-\frac{1}{12}\overline{\epsilon}^i\gamma_\mu\zeta_j-\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{jk\ell}\overline{\epsilon}^k\gamma_\mu\chi^{i\ell}-\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{k\ell j}E^i\overline{\epsilon}^k\psi_\mu^\ell\\
&-\overline{\psi}_\mu^i\eta_j-\text{h.c.}-\text{trace},\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)\mathcal{A}_\mu =&-\frac{1}{6}\mathrm{i}\overline{\epsilon}^i\phi_{\mu i}-\frac{1}{9}\mathrm{i}\epsilon^i\gamma_\mu\zeta_i+\frac{1}{6}\mathrm{i}\varepsilon_{k\ell p}E^p\overline{\epsilon}^k\psi_\mu^\ell+\frac{1}{6}\mathrm{i}\overline{\psi}_\mu^i\eta_i+\text{h.c.}\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)b_\mu =&\frac{1}{2}(\overline{\epsilon}^i\phi_{\mu i}-\overline{\psi}_\mu^i\eta_i)+\text{h.c.},\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)\Lambda_L =&\frac{1}{2}E_i\epsilon^i+\frac{1}{4}\gamma_{ab}T_i^{ab}\epsilon^i,\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)E_i =&\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}_i\not{D}\Lambda_L+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ijk}\overline{\epsilon}^j\zeta^k+\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^j\chi_{ij}-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ijk}E^k\overline{\epsilon}^j\Lambda_L+\overline{\eta}_i\Lambda_L,\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)T_{ab}^i =&-\frac{1}{4}\overline{\epsilon}^i\not{D}\gamma_{ab}\Lambda_R-\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ijk}\overline{\epsilon}_j\hat{R}_{ab}(Q_k)-\frac{1}{4}\overline{\epsilon}_j\gamma_{ab}\chi^{ij}+\frac{1}{12}\varepsilon^{ijk}\overline{\epsilon}_j\gamma_{ab}\zeta_k\\
&+\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ijk}E_j\overline{\epsilon}_k\gamma_{ab}\Lambda_R+\frac{1}{2}\overline{\eta}^i\gamma_{ab}\Lambda_R,\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)\chi_{ij} =&\frac{1}{4}\gamma_{ab}\not{D}T_{(i}^{ab}\epsilon_{j)}-\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{k\ell(i}\gamma^{ab}\hat{R}_{ab}(V_{j)}{}^\ell)\epsilon^k+\frac{1}{2}\not{D}E_{(i}\epsilon_{j)}-\frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_{k\ell(i}D_{j)}^\ell\epsilon^k\\
&-\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{k\ell(i}E^k\gamma_{ab}T_{j)}^{ab}\epsilon^\ell+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{k\ell(i}E_{j)}E^k\epsilon^\ell+\frac{1}{3}\overline{\Lambda}_L\gamma_a\epsilon_{(j}\gamma^a\zeta_{i)}\\
&-\frac{1}{2}\gamma_{ab}T_{(i}^{ab}\eta_{j)}+E_{(i}\eta_{j)},\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)\zeta^i =&\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon^{ijk}\not{D}E_j\epsilon_k+\frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^{ijk}\gamma_{ab}\not{D}T_k^{ab}\epsilon_j+\frac{1}{16}\gamma^{ab}\hat{R}_{ab}(V_k{}^{[i})\epsilon^{k]}+\frac{1}{2}\gamma^{ab}\hat{R}_{ab}\epsilon^i\\
&-\frac{1}{2}D_k^i\epsilon^k+\frac{1}{8}E^i\gamma_{ab}T_j^{ab}\epsilon^j-\frac{3}{8}E^j\gamma_{ab}T_j^{ab}\epsilon^i\\
&+\frac{3}{2}E_jE^{[i}\epsilon^{j]}+\frac{1}{4}(\overline{\Lambda}_R\gamma_aD_b\Lambda_L-\text{h.c.})\gamma^{ab}\epsilon^i\\
&+\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ijk}\overline{\Lambda}_L\gamma_a\epsilon_j\gamma^a\zeta_k+\frac{1}{3}\overline{\Lambda}_R\Lambda_R\overline{\Lambda}_L\Lambda_L\epsilon^i\\
&+\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ijk}\gamma_{ab}T_j^{ab}\eta_k+\frac{3}{2}\varepsilon^{ijk}E_j\eta_k,\\
\delta_{Q,S}(\epsilon,\eta)D_n^m =&-\frac{3}{4}\overline{\epsilon}^m\not{D}\zeta_n+\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon_{ijn}\overline{\epsilon}^i\not{D}\chi^{jm}+\varepsilon_{ijn}\overline{\epsilon}^j\zeta^mE^i
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&- 3E^p\overline{\epsilon}^m\chi_{pn} + \frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}^m\gamma_{ab}T_n^{ab} \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\not{D}} \Lambda_R + \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon_{ijn}E^jE^m\overline{\epsilon}^i\Lambda_L \\
&+ \overline{\epsilon}^m\gamma_a\zeta_n\overline{\Lambda}_R\gamma^a\Lambda_L - 2E_n\overline{\epsilon}^m\Lambda_L\overline{\Lambda}_R\Lambda_R + \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon_{ijn}\overline{\epsilon}^i\gamma_a\chi^{jm}\overline{\Lambda}_R\gamma^a\Lambda_L \\
&- \text{trace} + \text{h.c.},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}
$$

where

$$
D_\mu\epsilon^i = \left(\partial_\mu + \tfrac{1}{4}\omega_\mu{}^{ab}\gamma_{ab} + \tfrac{1}{2}b_\mu - \tfrac{1}{2}\mathrm{i}\mathcal{A}_\mu\right)\epsilon^i + V_{\mu j}{}^i\epsilon^j\,. \tag{4.8}
$$

Note that these variations immediately determine the variations of the different curvatures associated to the gauge symmetries. The explicit formula for deriving these variations is given in [47, chapter 11]. Also the variation of the dependent gauge fields is uniquely determined, although this is not of great interest, the curious reader is referred to [47] for a discussion on the topic. We will only give the matter dependent terms of the curvatures and dependent gauge fields.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\omega_\mu^{ab} &= \ldots, \\
\phi_\mu^i &= \ldots + \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^{ijk}\gamma^\nu\gamma_{ab}T_j^{ab}\gamma_\mu\psi_{\nu k} + \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ijk}\overline{\psi}_{\mu j}\psi_{\nu k}\gamma^\nu\Lambda_L, \\
\hat{R}_{\mu\nu}(Q^i) &= \ldots - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ijk}\gamma_{ab}T_j^{ab}\gamma_{[\mu}\psi_{\nu]k} - 2\varepsilon^{ijk}\overline{\psi}_{\nu j}\psi_{\mu k}\Lambda_L, \\
\hat{R}_{\mu\nu}(\mathcal{A}) &= \ldots + \frac{1}{6}\mathrm{i}\overline{\psi}^i_{[\nu}\gamma_{\mu]}\zeta_i - \frac{2}{3}\mathrm{i}\varepsilon_{k\ell p}E^p\overline{\psi}^k_\nu\psi^\ell_\mu + \text{h.c.}, \\
\hat{R}_{\mu\nu}(V_j{}^i) &= \ldots + \frac{3}{2}\overline{\psi}^i_{[\nu}\gamma_{\mu]}\zeta_j - \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon_{jk\ell}\overline{\psi}^k_{[\nu}\gamma_{\mu]}\chi^{i\ell} - 6\varepsilon_{k\ell j}E^i\overline{\psi}^k_\nu\psi^\ell_\mu - \text{h.c.}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}
$$

To determine these expressions one has to use the curvature constraints given in (2.26).

The nonlinear variations mentioned above are consistent with the soft algebra of the following form

$$
\begin{aligned}
[\delta_Q(\epsilon_1), \delta_Q(\epsilon_2)] &= \delta_{\text{cgct}}(\xi^\mu) + \delta_M(\epsilon_1^{ab}) + \delta_Q(\epsilon_3^i) + \delta_S(\eta_1^i) + \delta_{\text{SU(3)}}(\lambda_{1j}{}^i) + \delta_{\text{U(1)}}(\lambda_{1T}), \\
[\delta_Q(\epsilon), \delta_S(\eta)] &= \delta_D(\lambda_D) + \delta_M(\epsilon_2^{ab}) + \delta_S(\eta_2^i) + \delta_{\text{SU(3)}}(\lambda_{2j}{}^i) + \delta_{\text{U(1)}}(\lambda_{2T}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}
$$

The parameters of the variations are determined in a similar fashion as in the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ case. This analysis results in the following parameters:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\xi^\mu &= -\frac{1}{2}\overline{\epsilon}_1^i\gamma^\mu\epsilon_{2i}, \\
\epsilon_1^{ab} &= -\varepsilon_{ijk}\overline{\epsilon}_2^i\epsilon_1^jT^{abk} + \text{h.c.}\,, \\
\epsilon_3^i &= -\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{ijk}\overline{\epsilon}_{2j}\epsilon_{1k}\Lambda_L, \\
\eta_1^i &= \frac{3}{2}\epsilon_1^{[k}\epsilon_2^{l]}\delta_k^i\zeta_l - \frac{3}{4}(\overline{\epsilon}_2^i\gamma^a\epsilon_{1j} - \delta_j^i\overline{\epsilon}_1^k\gamma^a\overline{\epsilon}_{1k} + \text{h.c.})\gamma^aE^j\Lambda_L \\
&\quad - \frac{3}{2}\left[(\overline{\epsilon}_2^j\gamma_a\epsilon_{1j} + \text{h.c.})\gamma^a\zeta^i + \frac{3}{2}(\overline{\epsilon}_2^i\gamma_a\epsilon_{1j} + \text{h.c.})\gamma_a\zeta^j\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&- \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon^{ik\ell}\overline{\epsilon}_{1k}\epsilon_{2\ell}\not{D}\Lambda_L + 6\overline{\epsilon}_2^{[i}\epsilon_1^{j]}E_j\Lambda_R + \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon^{ijp}(\overline{\epsilon}_2^k\gamma_a\epsilon_{1j} + \text{h.c.})\gamma^a\chi_{kp},\\
\lambda_{1T} =& \frac{1}{6}\text{i}\varepsilon_{ijk}\overline{\epsilon}_2^j\epsilon_1^k E^i + \text{h.c.},\\
\lambda_{1j}{}^i =& -\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{jpq}\overline{\epsilon}_2^p\epsilon_1^q E^i - \text{h.c.} - \text{trace},\\
\lambda_D =& -\frac{1}{2}\overline{\eta}_i\epsilon^i + \text{h.c.},\\
\epsilon_2^{ab} =& \frac{1}{2}\overline{\eta}_i\gamma^{ab}\epsilon^i + \text{h.c.},\\
\eta_{2i} =& \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{ijk}\overline{\epsilon}^j\gamma_a\eta^k\gamma^a\Lambda_R,\\
\lambda_{2j}{}^i =& -\overline{\epsilon}^i\eta_j - \text{h.c.} - \text{trace},\\
\lambda_{2T} =& \frac{1}{6}\text{i}\overline{\epsilon}^i\eta_i + \text{h.c.}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.11}
$$

5 Conclusion

In this paper the gravity multiplet for $\mathcal{N}=3$ conformal supergravity in four dimensions has been constructed, also known as the $\mathcal{N}=3$ Weyl multiplet. The construction of this multiplet was done using three steps. First the known *current multiplet* of the $\mathcal{N}=4$ conformal supergravity theory was truncated to $\mathcal{N}=3$ supersymmetry. These currents are essential because they uniquely determine the Weyl multiplet. This one to one correspondence follows from the first order action in which each current is coupled to a field in the multiplet:

$$
S_1 \propto \int field \times current. \tag{5.1}
$$

The breaking of supersymmetry explicitly consisted of three consecutive steps:

1. put one supersymmetry parameter to zero $\epsilon_4 \to 0$,
2. determine the supersymmetry transformations restricted to the remaining three supersymmetries,
3. find a subset of currents that transform internally for the remaining three supersymmetries.

It was found that the subset of currents consisted of 64+64 $\subset$ 128+128 fermionic and bosonic components. The $128+128$ components refer to the case of $\mathcal{N}=4$ conformal supergravity. Inside the found multiplet 40 fermionic and 32 bosonic components were assigned to matter fields. These fields are generally necessary in extended supergravity to ensure an equal amount of fermionic and bosonic components.

The truncation thus split up the $128+128$ components in the original $\mathcal{N}=4$ conformal supergravity in two equal subsets. One of these subsets contained the gravity multiplet[9]

[9]Which includes the graviton, gravitino and gauge fields associated to the R-symmetry.

and the other multiplet could be interpreted as a matter multiplet. For the truncation to be consistent the two subsets had to be completely disjoint. This means that the gravity multiplet transforms internally under supersymmetries. But also that the matter multiplet did not act as a source into the gravity multiplet when the supersymmetries were applied. We found that this was indeed the case: To further argue that the correct multiplet of currents was found remark that previous literature suggested that the Weyl multiplet of $\mathcal{N} = 3$ conformal supergravity indeed had to consist of $64 + 64$ fermionic and bosonic components [36, 37].

The first order coupling in (5.1) can be viewed as a perturbation around flat space. By imposing invariance of this first order action, one systematically finds the linearized supersymmetry transformations. Determining the linear supersymmetry variations is the second step in the three step procedure. To make sure that the found variations were correct, their consistency with the algebra was checked. Namely, it was checked that the variations were consistent with the following relations: The third step in the procedure was to determine the nonlinear variations. In this step the large amount of symmetries in the superconformal group gets its merit. Consistency with the Lorentz, conformal and R-symmetries puts strong restrictions on the possible terms in the supersymmetry variations. Keeping these restrictions in mind all the thinkable terms were added to the variation, with a priori unknown coefficients. These coefficients were then determined by consistency with the soft algebra. In extended supergravity one normally finds such soft algebras instead of conventional Lie algebras, see [52–54] for a more detailed description of such algebras. In a soft algebra the commutator relations deform into (4.10).

Finally, we would like to elaborate on some possible future applications of the theory constructed in this paper. With the knowledge of the Weyl multiplet and its full supersymmetric variations one is able to research the possibilities for extending to higher order derivative theories as well. This was already done in [2] for $\mathcal{N} = 4$ conformal supergravity. However, because very little was known for the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ case this is still an open problem.

Also, applications in holography would be interesting with respect to this newly found theory. Recent papers, [19,20], have discussed several of these applications concerning $\mathcal{N} = 3$ Poincaré supergravity. It would be interesting to see in what way these results can be incorporated into the superconformal theory.

Acknowledgments.

We are grateful to N. Bobev, F. Gautason, T. Van Riet and G. Tartaglino-Mazzucchelli for interesting and useful discussions.

The work is supported in part by the Federal Office for Scientific, Technical and Cultural Affairs through the 'Interuniversity Attraction Poles Programme – Belgian Science Policy' P6/11-P, by the KU Leuven C1 grant ZKD1118 C16/16/005, and in part by COST Action MP1210 The String Theory Universe.

A Useful identities and conventions

A.1 Conventions

In general the conventions of [47] are used. Furthermore, for the calculations in this paper ones life is greatly simplified if spinorial and gamma-matrix identities from the book are used as well. Here we will mention a few important notions that could potentially cause for confusion.

Throughout this paper the mostly plus convention is used for the metric.

When a two sided derivative is used it will be with a minus sign when the derivative works as a right acting operator:

$$A \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}_\mu B := A\partial_\mu B - \partial_\mu(A)B. \tag{A.1}$$

A *dualized* tensor will be denoted with a tilde and we will use the following definition of a dualization:

$$\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu} := -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{i}\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}G^{\rho\sigma}. \tag{A.2}$$

A.2 Chiral notations

In $\mathcal{N}$-extended supersymmetry the fields are, amongst others, representations of the R-symmetry group. Specifically for $\mathcal{N}=3$ supersymmetry the fields are representations of the group $\mathrm{SU}(3)\times\mathrm{U}(1)$. For the $\mathcal{N}=4$ case on the other hand we have that the R-symmetry is described by SU(4). Concretely this means that the fields in such theories have extra indices, besides the possible spacetime and spinor indices. These indices will be denoted with Latin letters $i,j,k,\ldots$. Furthermore, we will use these indices to distinguish between fields and their charge conjugated versions. An example of this is given by the R-symmetry gauge field in the $\mathcal{N}=4$ and 3 Weyl multiplets described in Sections 2 and 3.1 respectively. The complex conjugation of this field is given by

$$(V_{\mu j}{}^{i})^c = V_\mu{}^j{}_i = -V_{\mu i}{}^j, \tag{A.3}$$

where the latter equation is due to the antihermiticity of these fields. For spinors we can use these indices to denote their chirality. For instance, take a spinor Λ_i, which is in a vector representation of the R-symmetry group. Using our notation one finds that

$$\Lambda_i = P_R\Lambda_i \Rightarrow (\Lambda_i)^c = \Lambda^i = P_L\Lambda^i. \tag{A.4}$$

For different spinors we have used different conventions for their chirality. This should become clear if one keeps in mind that for the supersymmetry parameters we use the following conventions

$$\gamma_*\epsilon^i = \epsilon^i\,, \qquad \gamma_*\eta^i = -\eta^i. \tag{A.5}$$

The chirality for all the other spinors then follow from consistencies in the supersymmetry transformations. For clarity all the conventions of the spinor chiralities with respect to the $\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{N})$ representation have been denoted in Table 6.

Theory ($\mathcal{N}$)	Spinor	Chirality	Spinor	Chirality
3	λ_L, λ_R	L,R	Λ_L, Λ_R	L,R
4	λ_i	R	Λ_i	L
3	ξ_{ij}	R	χ_{ij}	L
3			ζ_i	R
4	ξ_k^{ij}	R	χ_k^{ij}	L
3,4			ϕ_μ^i	R
3,4	$\mathcal{J}_\mu^i$	R	ψ_μ^i	L
3,4	Q_i	L	ϵ_i	R
3,4	S_i	R	η_i	L

Table 6: *The handedness of the different spinors with respect to the chiral notation.*

A.3 Traces and hermitian conjugation

In several supersymmetry variations we have used the notation of

$$\delta V = W - \text{ trace }, \quad \text{and} \quad \delta V = W + \text{h.c.}. \tag{A.6}$$

The meaning of these notations is the following. Say we have a tensor $D^{ij}_{k\ell}$ in some representation of SU($\mathcal{N}$) such that $D^{ij}_{k\ell} = D^{[ij]}_{[k\ell]}$ and $D^{kj}_{k\ell} = 0$. Then we will have to ensure that the supersymmetric variation of this tensor will have the same symmetry and trace properties. This is done by taking a variation of the following form

$$\delta D^{ij}_{k\ell} = V^{ij}_{k\ell} - \alpha \delta^{[i}_{[k} V^{j]p}_{\ell]p} - \beta \delta^{ij}_{k\ell} V^{pq}_{pq}. \tag{A.7}$$

The coefficients α and β are then determined by making $\delta D^{k\ell}_{kj}$ vanish identically. In the case of SU(4) this is done by taking $\alpha = 2$ and $\beta = -\frac{1}{3}$. If the field D is also hermitian we will have to ensure that the right-hand-side of the variation is also hermitian. The following example shows how this is done by adding the hermitian conjugated form of a variation. Let's assume that the tensor varies under a supersymmetry as

$$\delta D^{ij}_{k\ell} = \epsilon^{[i} W^{j]}_{[k\ell]}. \tag{A.8}$$

To ensure that this is hermitian we thus have to add its hermitian conjugated form, which is given by $(\epsilon^{[i} W^{j]}_{[k\ell]})^\dagger = \epsilon_{[i} W^{[k\ell]}_{j]}$. The supersymmetry variation of such a tenor is thus of the form

$$\delta D^{ij}_{k\ell} = V^{ij}_{k\ell} - \text{trace} + \text{h.c.}. \tag{A.9}$$

References

[1] M. Kaku and P. K. Townsend, *Poincaré supergravity as broken superconformal gravity*, Phys. Lett. **B76** (1978) 54

[2] F. Ciceri and B. Sahoo, *Towards the full $N = 4$ conformal supergravity action*, JHEP **01** (2016) 059, arXiv:1510.04999 [hep-th]

[3] D. Butter, F. Ciceri, B. de Wit and B. Sahoo, *All $N = 4$ conformal supergravities*, arXiv:1609.09083 [hep-th]

[4] L. Alvarez-Gaumé and D. Z. Freedman, *Geometrical structure and ultraviolet finiteness in the supersymmetric σ-model*, Commun. Math. Phys. **80** (1981) 443

[5] J. Bagger, *Supersymmetric sigma models*, in *Supersymmetry*, ed. K. Dietz et al., NATO Advanced Study Institute, Series B, Physics, vol. 125. Plenum Press, 1985

[6] O. Aharony and M. Evtikhiev, *On four dimensional $N = 3$ superconformal theories*, JHEP **04** (2016) 040, arXiv:1512.03524 [hep-th]

[7] I. García-Etxebarria and D. Regalado, *$\mathcal{N} = 3$ four dimensional field theories*, JHEP **03** (2016) 083, arXiv:1512.06434 [hep-th]

[8] T. Nishinaka and Y. Tachikawa, *On 4d rank-one $\mathcal{N} = 3$ superconformal field theories*, JHEP **09** (2016) 116, arXiv:1602.01503 [hep-th]

[9] O. Aharony and Y. Tachikawa, *S-folds and 4d $\mathcal{N} = 3$ superconformal field theories*, JHEP **06** (2016) 044, arXiv:1602.08638 [hep-th]

[10] Y. Imamura and S. Yokoyama, *Superconformal index of $\mathcal{N} = 3$ orientifold theories*, J. Phys. **A49** (2016), no. 43, 435401, arXiv:1603.00851 [hep-th]

[11] P. Agarwal and A. Amariti, *Notes on S-folds and $\mathcal{N} = 3$ theories*, JHEP **09** (2016) 032, arXiv:1607.00313 [hep-th]

[12] I. García-Etxebarria and D. Regalado, *Exceptional $\mathcal{N} = 3$ theories*, arXiv:1611.05769 [hep-th]

[13] M. Lemos, P. Liendo, C. Meneghelli and V. Mitev, *Bootstrapping $\mathcal{N} = 3$ superconformal theories*, arXiv:1612.01536 [hep-th]

[14] V. O. Rivelles and J. G. Taylor, *Off-shell extended supergravity and central charges*, Phys. Lett. **B104** (1981) 131–135

[15] L. Brink, M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and J. H. Schwarz, *Extended supergravity as geometry of superspace*, Phys. Lett. **B76** (1978) 417–422

[16] A. S. Galperin, E. A. Ivanov and V. I. Ogievetsky, *Superspaces for $N = 3$ supersymmetry*, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **46** (1987) 543, [Yad. Fiz.46,948(1987)]

[17] L. Castellani, A. Ceresole, S. Ferrara, R. D'Auria, P. Fre and E. Maina, *The complete $N = 3$ matter coupled supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B268** (1986) 317–348

[18] S. Ferrara, P. Fre and L. Girardello, *Spontaneously broken $N = 3$ supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B274** (1986) 600–618

[19] P. Karndumri and K. Upathambhakul, *Gaugings of four-dimensional $N = 3$ supergravity and AdS_4/CFT_3 holography*, Phys. Rev. **D93** (2016), no. 12, 125017, arXiv:1602.02254 [hep-th]

[20] P. Karndumri, *Supersymmetric Janus solutions in four-dimensional $N = 3$ gauged supergravity*, Phys. Rev. **D93** (2016), no. 12, 125012, arXiv:1604.06007 [hep-th]

[21] W. Nahm, *Supersymmetries and their representations*, Nucl. Phys. **B135** (1978) 149

[22] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo and B. de Wit, *Conformal supergravity in ten dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B217** (1983) 489

[23] A. Salam and E. Sezgin, *Supergravities in diverse dimensions. vol. 1, 2*, North-Holland (1989)

[24] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and H. Nishino, *Heterotic σ models and conformal supergravity in two-dimensions*, Phys. Lett. **B166** (1986) 141

[25] J. McCabe and B. Velikson, *A classification of two-dimensional conformal supergravity theories with finite dimensional algebras*, Phys. Rev. **D40** (1989) 400

[26] P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *$D = 3$ Conformal supergravity and Chern-Simons Terms*, Phys. Rev. **D32** (1985) 872

[27] M. Roček and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *$\mathcal{N} \geq 2$ supersymmetric Chern-Simons terms as $d = 3$ extended conformal supergravity*, Class. Quant. Grav. **3** (1986) 43

[28] U. Lindström and M. Roček, *Superconformal gravity in three dimensions as a gauge theory*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** (1989) 2905

[29] M. Kaku, P. K. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Properties of conformal supergravity*, Phys. Rev. **D17** (1978) 3179

[30] B. de Wit, J. W. van Holten and A. Van Proeyen, *Transformation rules of $N = 2$ supergravity multiplets*, Nucl. Phys. **B167** (1980) 186–204, erratum **B172** (1980) 543–544

[31] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo and B. de Wit, *Extended conformal supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B182** (1981) 173

[32] T. Kugo and K. Ohashi, *Supergravity tensor calculus in* $5D$ *from* $6D$, Prog. Theor. Phys. **104** (2000) 835–865, `hep-ph/0006231`

[33] E. Bergshoeff, S. Cucu, M. Derix, T. de Wit, R. Halbersma and A. Van Proeyen, *Weyl multiplets of* $N = 2$ *conformal supergravity in five dimensions*, JHEP **06** (2001) 051, `hep-th/0104113`

[34] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and A. Van Proeyen, *Superconformal tensor calculus and matter couplings in six dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B264** (1986) 653, [Erratum: Nucl. Phys.B598,667(2001)]

[35] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and A. Van Proeyen, $(2, 0)$ *tensor multiplets and conformal supergravity in* $D = 6$, Class. Quant. Grav. **16** (1999) 3193–3206, `hep-th/9904085`

[36] E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, *Conformal supergravity*, Phys. Rept. **119** (1985) 233–362

[37] P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Relations between Chern-Simons terms, anomalies and conformal supergravity*, in *Nuffield Workshop on Supersymmetry and its Applications Cambridge, England, June 23-July 14, 1985*, p. 0063. 1985. `http://alice.cern.ch/format/showfull?sysnb=0074554`.

[38] S. Ferrara, *An overview on broken supergravity models*, Proc. of the Second Oxford Quantum Gravity Conference, April 1980

[39] S. Ferrara, C. A. Savoy and B. Zumino, *General massive multiplets in extended supersymmetry*, Phys. Lett. **B100** (1981) 393

[40] V. Ogievetsky and E. Sokatchev, *On vector superfield generated by supercurrent*, Nucl. Phys. **B124** (1977) 309–316

[41] P. S. Howe, K. S. Stelle and P. K. Townsend, *Supercurrents*, Nucl. Phys. **B192** (1981) 332–352

[42] P. S. Howe and U. Lindström, *Counterterms for extended supergravity.*, in *Nuffield Workshop on Superspace and Supergravity Cambridge, England, June 16 - July 12, 1980*, pp. 413–422. 1980.

[43] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo, J. W. van Holten, B. de Wit and A. Van Proeyen, *Extended conformal supergravity and its applications*, in *Cambridge Workshop 1980:237*, p. 237. 1980.

[44] W. Siegel, *On-shell O(N) supergravity in superspace*, Nucl. Phys. **B177** (1981) 325–332

[45] E. A. Bergshoeff, *Conformal invariance in supergravity.* PhD thesis, Leiden U., 1983.

[46] L. Brink, J. H. Schwarz and J. Scherk, *Supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories*, Nucl.Phys. **B121** (1977) 77

[47] D. Z. Freedman and A. Van Proeyen, *Supergravity*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

[48] S. Ferrara, M. Kaku, P. K. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Unified field theories with $U(N)$ internal symmetries: Gauging the superconformal group*, Nucl. Phys. **B129** (1977) 125

[49] E. Cremmer and B. Julia, *The* SO(8) *supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B159** (1979) 141

[50] M. de Roo, *Matter coupling in $N = 4$ supergravity*, Nucl.Phys. **B255** (1985) 515

[51] P. S. Howe, *Supergravity in superspace*, Nucl. Phys. **B199** (1982) 309

[52] I. A. Batalin and G. A. Vilkovisky, *Quantization of gauge theories with linearly dependent generators*, Phys. Rev. **D28** (1983) 2567–2582, erratum **D30** (1984) 508

[53] M. Henneaux, *Lectures on the antifield - BRST formalism for gauge theories*, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **18A** (1990) 47–106

[54] J. Gomis, J. París and S. Samuel, *Antibracket, antifields and gauge theory quantization*, Phys. Rep. **259** (1995) 1–145, `hep-th/9412228`